

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(Mr. Izac asked and received permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address by Mr. Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, at a recent convention of that organization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 13, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

The Committee on the Public Lands will have a hearing on Wednesday, September 13, 1944, at 10 a. m., in the committee room to consider H. R. 4286, H. R. 4697, H. R. 4555, H. R. 5235, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 5041. A bill to amend the Veterans' Regulations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1882). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3639. A bill for the relief of Herman Weinert, Jr., M. D.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1880). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3931. A bill for the relief of A. D. Gibson, M. D.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1881). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 5344. A bill to authorize long-distance telephone calls by military personnel at Government expense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5345. A bill to provide for the reconversion of small industries to civilian production, to expedite the reentry into business of small businessmen whose businesses have been curtailed or closed because of war emergencies, to aid men and women of our armed forces and others who desire to enter into business on their own after the war, and to encourage the free flow of American capital into small- and intermediate-sized enterprises, by the establishment of a permanent Small Business Finance Corporation within the Federal Reserve System to assist financing institutions in making short- and long-term credit available to small- and intermediate-sized enterprises; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. Res. 638. A resolution establishing a select committee to be known as the Committee on the Sale and Disposition of Surplus Government-owned Property; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H. R. 5346. A bill for the relief of Lindon A. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEAN:

H. R. 5347. A bill for the relief of Joseph Wyzynski; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5348. A bill for the relief of William D. McCauley; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6099. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition submitted by St. Louis Industrial Union Council, of St. Louis, Mo., signed by 1,800 members praying for full employment, full production, and a national income level equal to our wartime national income, holding that they are essentials to a national program of reconversion if our country is to enjoy peace and prosperity in the post-war period and if our soldiers, sailors, and war workers are to have jobs and a decent standard of living. They also advocate the principles contained in the Kilgore bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6100. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Department Store Employees Union, No. 1100, of San Francisco, covering need for plan to assure full employment in post-war period; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

6101. By the SPEAKER: Petition of J. M. Garcia, Tapachula, Chiapas, Mexico, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the return to Mexico of the territory of El Chamizal; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1944

(Legislative day of Friday, September 1, 1944)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of our salvation: Cause us to know Thy loving kindness in the

morning, for in Thee do we trust; cause us to know the way wherein we should walk, for we lift up our souls unto Thee. Touch our tasks this day with some gleam of Thy glory until, blind and willful though we are, we begin living as they should live who have eternity set in their hearts. Lift us more and more into the steady sense of our kinship with Thee.

In Thy light may we bring to the bar of judgment the hopes which have misled us, the motives which shame us, the methods which have failed us, and the values which have cheated us. Defeat us in all else save the doing of Thy will. Give us a part in making the earth's crooked ways straight, when social and industrial relations will lose their hard antagonisms and become the hallowed cooperation of comrades in human service. Toward this high purpose may we labor while our brief day lasts, in quiet confidence forever sure that Thou wilt guide our steps and keep our feet from falling. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D. C., September 13, 1944.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY, a Senator from the State of Connecticut, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MALONEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Tuesday, September 12, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3608) relating to certain overtime compensation of civilian employees of the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION— LELAND OLDS

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Cordon	McKellar
Andrews	Danaher	Maloney
Ball	Davis	Maybank
Bankhead	Ferguson	Mead
Barkley	George	Millikin
Bridges	Gillette	Moore
Buck	Gurney	O'Daniel
Burton	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bushfield	Hill	Reed
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Reynolds
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Caraway	Kilgore	Russell
Chavez	Langer	Scruggs
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Shipstead
Connally	McClellan	Stewart

Thomas, Okla.	Vandenberg	Wherry
Thomas, Utah	Walsh, Mass.	White
Tunnell	Walsh, N. J.	Wiley
Tydings	Weeks	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The matter before the Senate is the nomination of Leland Olds, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination? Under the order of the Senate of yesterday, no further debate is permissible.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] whether he desires a ye-and-nay vote?

Mr. MOORE. That is correct; I desire a ye-and-nay vote.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I call for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, may I make a correction in the RECORD?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No debate is in order at this time.

Mr. TUNNELL. What I propose to do does not constitute debate. I simply wanted to know if I could make a correction in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that that is in the nature of debate and must go over for the present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination? [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I understood the Chair to announce the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Olds.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; the nomination of Mr. Olds has been confirmed.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I request that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

NOMINATIONS OF ADMIRAL CHESTER W. NIMITZ AND ADMIRAL ROYAL E. INGERSOLL

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, from the Committee on Naval Affairs I report favorably the nomination of Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 31st day of December 1941.

I also report from the same committee the nomination of Admiral Royal E. Ingersoll, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of July 1942.

In connection with this report, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Naval Affairs Committee giving the reasons for the promotions of Admiral Nimitz and Admiral Ingersoll to the rank of admiral in the Navy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A law enacted more than 20 years ago authorized the officers who were assigned to duty as commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet and commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet to assume the rank of admiral while serving in these positions. These officers are not confirmed by the Senate and revert to their permanent status upon being detached from these particular duties. This law has been amended from time to time so that three officers of the Navy who hold important command positions may be designated as admirals without being confirmed by the Senate.

Admirals Nimitz and Ingersoll hold their ranks as admiral by virtue of being assigned to duty, respectively, as commander in chief of the Pacific and Atlantic Fleets. Upon being detached from these specific duties these officers would revert to their permanent rank of rear admiral.

Approximately 3 years ago Congress enacted legislation authorizing officers to be temporarily promoted during the war and for a period of 6 months thereafter. It provided also that officers promoted to the rank of admiral should be confirmed by the Senate.

The nominations pending before the committee of Admirals Nimitz and Ingersoll are nominations under the more recent law, which provides that they shall hold the temporary rank of admiral during the war and for a period of 6 months thereafter, regardless of what duties they may be assigned.

THE EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, while we are engaged in executive business, I think we might as well dispose of the Executive Calendar for today. Therefore I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard F. Houk to be United States attorney for the district of New Mexico.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Benjamin J. McKinney to be United States marshal for the district of Arizona.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the United States Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make the same request with respect to the nominations of postmasters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters on the calendar are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should like to have the consideration of the nominations in the Army go over until Friday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Or until the next session.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whether Friday or some other day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the consideration of the nominations in the Army will go over as requested.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President

will be notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, all of our proceedings up to the present moment have been in executive session. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider legislative business.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate letters from the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and the executive secretary, Office of Scientific Research and Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending December 31, 1944, which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. REYNOLDS, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 2145) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the time within which application may be made for reemployment, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3608) relating to certain overtime compensation of civilian employees of the United States, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Claims.

FEDERAL AID FOR POST-WAR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUSHFIELD and Mr. RUSSELL each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 2105) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to pro-

vide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES — CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 1 THROUGH JULY 31, 1944.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures, I desire to present a report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Government for the period April 1 through July 31, 1944. I ask unanimous consent that a statement explanatory of the report, and the report itself, be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement and report were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT

The total number of paid employees for July 1944 is 3,112,965, excluding 252,978 employees of the War Department outside of continental United States.

The total employment for July 1944, is 17,502 in excess of the employment peak of 3,095,463 reached in the month of June 1943. This figure is exclusive of the employees of the War Department outside the continental United States.

Thirty-seven departments and agencies have increased 101,749 between May 1, 1944, to July 31, 1944, while 26 departments and agencies have eliminated only 5,703 employees, making a net increase of 96,046 for the period. For the first 7 months (January 1 to July 31, 1944) the net increase is 134,736.

Substantial increases were made by the following: War Department, 40,051; Navy Department, 31,030; Post Office Department, 9,001; Interior Department, 3,767; and Veterans' Administration, 2,535.

Greatest reductions were made by the following: Selective Service, 879; National Housing, 766; Tennessee Valley Authority, 657; and Office of Civilian Defense, 538.

The increase in the War Department is in part due to 24,000 force account employees and 9,600 not reported before as coming under the pay rolls of A. S. F. (Army Service Forces) and Army Air Corps. Further information will be furnished by said Department if necessary. The increase in the Post

Office Department is due to the temporary substitute employees.

Following the last report to the Senate on the status of Federal civilian employees of the Federal Government presented June 23, 1944, the Civil Service Commission, in a report to the President and a release to the press, indicated that there had been a reduction in the number of civil-service employees and an increase in manpower utilization. Reports received by the committee show quite the contrary. In presenting the last report on personnel in June, the record showed that there had been a steady net increase in the number of Federal civilian employees for the months of January, February, March, and April.

In submitting the present personnel report for the months of May, June and July, the figures received show that the number of Federal civilian employees is still on the increase despite the impression made by the Civil Service Commission's press release that "personnel is being reduced" and "manpower utilization is being outstandingly increased." These increases are shown on the table attached.

On August 25, 1944, I wrote to Harry B. Mitchell, President, United States Civil Service Commission, regarding this report and press release and asked for information showing the reduction in total paid civilian employees within the continental limits of the United States since January 1, 1944. Reply to this letter was received under date of September 1, with a table enclosed showing figures for March 31, 1944, and June 30, 1944. The Commission implies in its letter that a reduction in paid civilian employees has been made, whereas the table enclosed shows an increase in the total paid civilian employees. The Commission states further that actually the personnel of the War Department has increased in recent months but falls to state or admit that the total paid civilian personnel also has increased. When we realize that the ratio of Federal civilian employees to State civilian employees is now about 7 to 1, it is further evident that the Federal Government is considerably overstaffed. About 5 percent of the working population of the United States works for the executive branch of the Federal Government, approximately 3,000,000 people. Approximately 10 percent of these are in the Washington, D. C., area; another 10 percent in the State of New York, and approximately 9 percent in California. The remainder are scattered across the other 46 States. If this army of Federal employees were lined up four abreast in military formation, the line would reach from Washington, D. C., to New York City.

REPORT

Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government, by departments and agencies, for months of April, May, June, and July 1944, showing increases and decreases in number of paid employees

Department or agency	1944				Increase	Decrease
	April	May	June	July		
Executive Office of the President: Bureau of the Budget.....	548	552	545	563	15	
Departments:						
Agriculture Department.....	82,071	80,025	80,925	81,991		80
Commerce Department.....	29,270	29,733	30,095	29,638	368	
Interior Department ^{1,2}	40,762	42,038	43,313	44,529	3,767	
Justice Department.....	29,201	29,364	29,722	29,943	742	
Labor Department.....	6,114	6,597	6,825	6,977	863	
Navy Department ¹	736,797	747,055	765,929	767,827	31,030	
Post Office Department.....	352,476	348,166	352,778	361,477	9,001	
State Department.....	8,545	8,548	8,859	8,909	364	
Treasury Department.....	92,093	93,264	94,308	94,019	1,926	
War Department ³	1,225,590	1,234,919	1,262,913	1,265,641	40,051	
National war agencies:						
Committee on Fair Employment Practice.....	113	122	123	117	4	
Division of Central Administrative Services.....	4,044	4,068	3,986	3,814		230
Foreign Economic Administration.....	5,638	5,629	5,699	5,818	180	
National War Labor Board.....	3,711	3,977	3,689	4,616	905	
Office of Alien Property Custodian.....	894	891	890	878		16

¹ Includes 10,324 employees of Navy and 112 of Interior now in the hands of the enemy.

² Increase due to seasonal employees.

³ Does not include employees outside continental United States.

REPORT—Continued.

Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government, by departments and agencies, for months of April, May, June, and July 1944, showing increases and decreases in number of paid employees—Continued

Department or agency	1944				Increase	Decrease
	April	May	June	July		
National war agencies—Continued.						
Office of Censorship.....	12,077	11,942	11,871	11,647	430	
Office of Civilian Defense.....	684	452	292	146	538	
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.....	1,375	1,366	1,367	1,357	18	
Office of Defense Transportation.....	5,141	5,155	5,138	5,181	40	
Office of Economic Stabilization.....	11	11	10	10	1	
Office of Price Administration.....	59,015	60,547	60,782	60,799	1,784	
Office of Scientific Research and Development.....	1,191	1,248	1,293	1,340	149	
Office of Strategic Service.....	1,857	1,934	1,946	2,061	204	
Office of War Information.....	7,201	7,959	8,283	8,522	1,321	
Office of War Mobilization.....	36	49	51	58	22	
Petroleum Administration for War.....	1,308	1,279	1,277	1,264	44	
Selective Service.....	23,998	23,859	23,589	23,119	879	
Smaller War Plants Corporation.....	1,746	1,740	1,746	1,750	4	
War Manpower Commission.....	26,075	27,901	27,002	27,338	1,263	
War Production Board.....	16,993	16,748	16,565	17,268	275	
War Shipping Administration.....	5,037	4,838	4,694	4,852	185	
Independent agencies:						
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	1	1	1	1		
Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation.....	51	47	28	22	29	
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	330	336	336	343	13	
Civil Service Commission.....	7,498	7,736	7,640	7,521	23	
Employees Compensation Commission.....	513	510	509	523	10	
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	60	59	58	59	11	
Federal Communications Commission.....	2,162	2,063	1,871	1,712	450	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,058	1,039	1,017	1,002	56	
Federal Power Commission.....	663	663	668	669	6	
Federal Security Agency.....	30,978	31,503	31,082	31,338	360	
Federal Trade Commission.....	454	451	450	451	3	
Federal Works Agency.....	20,593	20,303	20,252	20,226	367	
General Accounting Office.....	11,221	11,444	11,992	12,644	1,423	
Government Printing Office.....	7,434	7,290	7,283	7,249	185	
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,159	2,132	2,135	2,147	12	
Maritime Commission.....	9,970	10,509	10,593	10,781	811	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	5,508	5,753	6,090	6,262	754	
National Archives.....	257	340	349	366	9	
National Capital Housing Authority.....	257	258	249	250	7	
National Capital Park and Planning.....	18	19	18	17	1	
National Gallery of Art.....	260	261	262	258	2	
National Housing Agency.....	19,183	18,827	18,900	18,417	766	
National Labor Relations Board.....	679	681	713	718	39	
National Mediation Board.....	91	83	86	90	1	
Panama Canal.....	29,538	28,717	28,651	30,361	823	
Railroad Retirement Board.....	1,720	1,745	1,789	1,829	109	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	7,892	8,221	8,287	8,550	658	
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	1,209	1,206	1,196	1,192	17	
Smithsonian Institution.....	418	419	430	430	12	
Tariff Commission.....	306	305	303	301	5	
Tax Court of the United States.....	123	122	124	123		
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	21,800	21,838	21,025	21,143	657	
Veterans' Administration.....	50,803	51,226	52,069	53,338	2,535	
Total.....	3,016,919	3,038,143	3,092,961	3,113,802	101,863	4,980
Net increase.....					96,883	
War Department civilian employees stationed outside of continental United States, as of June 30, 1944 ¹	252,978	252,978	252,978	252,978		
Grand total.....	3,269,897	3,291,121	3,345,939	3,366,780		

¹ Reported quarterly.

² Employees outside continental United States spread over various departments and agencies, totals, May, 11,358; June, 12,506; July, 11,472.

Note.—Employment figures now reported to the committee include dollar-per-annum, terminal leave, and without-compensation employees of the consultant-expert type who are authorized to receive per diem in lieu of subsistence.

Totals of Federal civilian employees and net monthly increases

	Monthly totals ¹	Net increases
January.....	2,978,229	-----
February.....	2,983,466	5,237
March.....	2,997,452	13,986
April.....	3,016,897	19,445
May.....	3,038,143	21,246
June.....	3,092,961	54,818
July.....	3,112,965	20,004
		134,736

¹ Exclusive of War Department employees stationed outside of continental United States, 252,978.

VIEWS OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS—ADDRESS BY EDWARD A. O'NEAL

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, at the Northeastern Regional Farm Bureau meeting, New York, N. Y., on August 23, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN WAR DADS—STATEMENT BY JOHN M. COLLINS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement by John M. Collins, chairman of the National Committee on Public Relations of the American War Dads, setting forth the aims and objectives of the American War Dads, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ICKES BEFORE NINTH CONVENTION OF U. A. W.-C. I. O., AT GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record the address delivered by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, before the ninth convention of the International Union United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, at Grand Rapids, Mich., September 12, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENTS ON RETIREMENT OF JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. WALSH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record

an editorial entitled "Sunny Jim Farley Makes His Exit," published in the Hastings (Nebr.) Daily Tribune of June 9, 1944, and an editorial entitled "Mr. Farley Dismounts," published in the Flint (Mich.) Journal of June 13, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, inasmuch as we shall probably have a call of the calendar some time soon, and because there are a number of bills which are ready to be reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, but upon which reports have not yet been filed, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file such reports as the committee has ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Subsequently, under authority of the order, supra, the following reports were

submitted today from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1746. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Peter A. Condelario a patent in fee to certain land; without amendment (Rept. No. 1090).

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1953. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1091).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

H. R. 2185. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the purposes of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), to purchase logs, lumber, and other forest products; with amendments (Rept. No. 1092).

FORFEITURE OF PAY OF PERSONS IN MILITARY AND NAVAL SERVICE IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1250) to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct, which were on page 1, to strike out all after line 5, over to and including line 5 of page 2, and insert:

SEC. 2. That paragraph VIII of Executive Order No. 6098, dated March 31, 1933 (Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended; 38 U. S. C., ch. 12), be amended to read as follows:

"PAR. VIII. An injury or disease incurred during military or naval service will be deemed to have been incurred in line of duty and not the result of the veteran's own misconduct when the person on whose account benefits are claimed was, at the time the injury was suffered or disease contracted, in active service in the military or naval forces, whether on active duty or on authorized leave, unless such injury or disease was the result of his own willful misconduct: *Provided*, That venereal disease shall not be presumed to be due to willful misconduct if the person in service complies with the Army or Navy regulations requiring him to report and receive treatment for such disease: *Provided further*, That the requirement for line of duty will not be met if it appears that at the time the injury was suffered or disease contracted the person on whose account benefits are claimed (1) was avoiding duty by deserting the service, or by absenting himself without leave materially interfering with the performance of military duties; (2) was confined under sentence of court martial or civil court."

SEC. 3. That paragraph IX of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, be and is hereby amended to read:

"PAR. IX. Pension shall not be payable under part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, for any disability due to the claimant's own willful misconduct or vicious habits."

SEC. 4. This act shall be effective from the date of its approval. Sections 2 and 3, inclusive, shall be applicable to claims filed or adjudicated thereafter and the beginning date of awards shall be as provided in applicable statute or regulations: *Provided*, That no claim heretofore disallowed by reason of misconduct or line of duty requirement shall be revived but benefits may be payable

on the basis of a new claim filed hereafter in such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct, and to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to define line of duty and misconduct for pension and compensation purposes."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Colorado indicate what are the House amendments in which the Senator is proposing that the Senate concur?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Senate bill 1250 is a bill to repeal section 2 of the act approved March 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct.

This bill passed the Senate, and in the form in which it passed it was objected to by the Veterans' Administration. General Hines made a recommendation to the committee in the House which was considering the Senate bill, and the committee amended it in keeping with the recommendations of General Hines.

General Hines wrote a letter, which may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 11, last, on page 7641, in which he states his position, and in which he says that the amendments which he recommends, and which have been adopted by the House, are approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to.

TERMINATION CLAUSES IN EMERGENCY LEGISLATION

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, all the members of Senate committees have experienced from time to time difficulties in determining what language to use in fixing termination clauses in emergency legislation. Recently I inquired of the Navy Department whether or not it has made a study of and reached any conclusions as to conditions which should exist to render operative the various termination clauses that have been used in emergency legislation affecting the Navy. I inquired if the Attorney General had rendered an opinion on this subject, as other departments of the Government are affected in a similar manner.

The Secretary of the Navy has replied to my letter, informing me that the Attorney General has not rendered any formal opinion on the general subject, but he states that the Department of Justice has compiled a list of statutes with classifications as to termination clauses and that an extensive list of war and emergency statutes has also been compiled by the Legislative Reference

Service of the Library of Congress. He enclosed a list of temporary laws relating to the Navy in force on July 31, 1944. The enumeration of the various clauses used in emergency statutes and the observations made in reference to each will be found interesting and useful when Congress considers terminating certain temporary laws.

I ask that the letter and other data be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, September 1, 1944.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman of the Committee on
Naval Affairs, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of June 2, 1944, asking whether the Navy Department has made a study of, and reached conclusions, as to conditions which must exist to render operative various termination clauses contained in emergency legislation enacted since December 7, 1941. It was pointed out in your letter that possibly the Attorney General may have rendered an opinion on this subject as many other departments of the Government are affected in a similar manner.

It appears that the Attorney General has not rendered any formal opinion on the general subject. However, a list of statutes with classifications as to termination clauses was compiled by the Department of Justice some several months ago. An extensive list of war and emergency statutes has also been compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. This list is contained in Bulletin No. 20 of the Public Affairs bulletins of the Library. Neither list is strictly up to date.

There is enclosed a list of temporary laws relating to the Navy, in force on July 31, 1944, compiled in the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

In reviewing the problems raised by war and emergency legislation becoming ineffective on some date connected with the end of the war, it is apparent at the outset that the problem is of necessity much broader than that of legislation enacted after December 7, 1941. As indicated by the enclosure, some important temporary legislation was enacted over a period of several months prior to that date. Further there is a considerable body of permanent legislation effective only in time of war or emergency which will raise the same practical problems at the close of the war or the end of the emergency as are raised by the temporary acts. The Library of Congress bulletin above referred to includes some 260 acts, enacted before December 7, 1941, in this latter class. Some of these acts are of such age as to be included in the Revised Statutes.

The following classification can be made of war or emergency statutes, according to the nature of the contingency upon whose happening they expire:

1. EXPIRING AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE WAR

This would include not only temporary legislation effective "during the present war," "during any war in which the United States is now engaged," "until the termination of the present war with Germany, Italy, and Japan," but also permanent legislation operative "in time of war," "during the existence of war in which the United States is engaged," "whenever a state of war exists." The difficulty lies in the determination of the date on which the war terminates for purposes of determining when the statute ceases to be effective. This difficulty is resolved by provisions in many of the statutes provid-

ing for determination of such date by the President in a proclamation or other method of designation or by the Congress by concurrent or joint resolution. Lacking such guides, it is necessary to refer to the previous court decisions on the same problem following past wars.

The determination of the date of termination of war is for the political branch of the Federal Government, and is usually made by a formal proclamation. It is not a question of fact to be determined by the judiciary. The Court in *Hamilton v. McClaughry* (136 Fed. 445 (Apr. 12, 1905)), stated:

"It is the well-settled law that the existence of a condition of war must be determined by the political department of the Government; that the courts take judicial notice of such determination and are bound thereby," and cited in support thereof *U. S. v. 129 Packages* (Fed. Cas. No. 15, 941); *Sutton v. Tiller* (98 Am. Dec. 471).

It is clear that the date of termination of the war is that date established by unequivocal public proclamation by the President or proper legislative action by the Congress. No event precedent to that time is sufficient to predicate a termination of the war in the legal sense.

Thus the Civil War was terminated by President Johnson's proclamation of August 20, 1866 (14 Stat. 817), declaring that the insurrection against the Nation was at an end; and that peace, order, tranquillity, and civil authority existed in and throughout the whole of the United States of America. This date was recognized as the date of the termination of the war by the Congress in section 2 of the act of March 2, 1867 (14 Stat. 422).

The United States Supreme Court approved this date in the case of *McElrath v. United States* (102 U. S. 426, 438, October term 1880), holding that the limitation "except in time of peace" on the power of the President to summarily dismiss a military officer, contemplated not a mere cessation of hostilities, but peace in the complete sense, officially proclaimed.

A variety of termination clauses was adopted by Congress for war and emergency legislation adopted during World War No. 1. The provisions of the termination clauses of the more important World War No. 1 emergency acts are given in a note at 251 United States, page 165. "Conclusion of the war" as used by Congress was held in *Hamilton v. Kentucky Distilleries Co.* (251 U. S. 146; 40 Sup. Ct. 106) not to mean the mere cessation of hostilities. This case involved a prosecution under the Wartime Prohibition Act (40 Stat. 1045, 1046), which was enacted in reliance on war-emergency powers of the Congress and became effective 10 days after the signing of the armistice with Germany (November 11, 1918).

The Court continued "nor may we assume that Congress intended by the phrase to designate the date when the treaty of peace should be signed at Versailles or elsewhere by German and American representatives, since by the Constitution a treaty is only a proposal until approved by the Senate. Furthermore, to construe 'conclusion of war' as meaning the actual termination of war activities would leave wholly uncertain the date the act would cease to be operative; whereas Congress evinced here, as in other war statutes, a clear purpose that the date of expiration should be definitely fixed."

A similar result was reached in *Kahn v. Anderson* (255 U. S. 1, 10 (Jan. 31, 1921)) wherein it was held that the ninety-second article of the Articles of War (1916), providing that "no person shall be tried by court-martial for murder or rape committed within the geographical limits of the States of the Union and the District of Columbia in time of peace" contemplates a complete peace, officially proclaimed, and that such a peace was not brought about by the armistice and the cessation of hostilities in the war with Germany and Austria.

Because of the failure of the President and the Senate to agree on a definitive treaty of peace following World War No. 1, considerable delay and confusion resulted in the determination of the date of termination of the war.

President Wilson in his message to Congress of November 11, 1918, transmitting terms of the armistice, stated "the war thus comes to an end, for having accepted these terms of the armistice, it will be impossible for the German command to renew it." Despite a few contrary decisions, such as *United States v. Hicks*, 256 Fed. 707 (1919) (which appear to be ill-considered), the President's statement has not been accepted as an official proclamation of the legal end of the war.

On July 14, 1919, a general enemy trade license was issued by the Department of State, authorizing all persons in the United States to trade and communicate with persons residing in Germany. On July 15, 1919, by order of the Postmaster General, the post office facilities were opened to receive mail matter destined for Germany and coming from Germany.

President Wilson was unwilling to take action to officially terminate the war. In answer to a question by Senator Fall, in August 1919, the President replied that in his judgment he did not have the power by proclamation to declare that peace exists, and that in no circumstances could he consent to take such a course prior to the ratification of a final treaty of peace.

In the early months of 1920 the Congress passed a resolution declaring the state of war at an end. This resolution was vetoed by the President on May 27, 1920, and the House of Representatives sustained the veto.

Considerable discussion resulted as to whether Congress or the President could separately terminate the state of war. (As to power of Congress to declare peace, see 18 Michigan Law Review (May 1920) pp. 669-675 wherein Edward S. Corwin argues that Congress has such power simply by virtue of its power to repeal its previous enactments (e. g. the Declaration of War). Also John M. Mathews, *The Termination of War* (19 Mich. Law Review 819).

So far as war legislation was concerned the question was finally resolved by the joint resolution of March 3, 1921 (Public Res. No. 64, ch. 136, 41 Stat. 1359).

The resolution of March 3, 1921, provided that the effective date of the resolution should be construed and treated as the date of the termination of the war or of the present or existing emergency in the interpretation of any acts of Congress, joint resolutions, or proclamations of President containing provisions contingent upon the duration or the date of the termination of the war or the present or existing emergency. Certain statutes, including the Trading with the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, were excepted from the operation of the resolution.

2. EXPIRING ON THE CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES

The expressions "cessation of hostilities," "termination of hostilities," present difficulties of interpretation unless accompanied by provision for self-determination, such as determination or proclamation of the President, or resolution by the Congress. The cases previously cited distinguish the "cessation of hostilities" and the "conclusion of the war." (*McElrath v. United States*, 102 U. S. 426; *Hamilton v. Kentucky Distilleries Co.*, 251 U. S. 146; *Kahn v. Anderson*, 255 U. S. 1, 10.)

These cases indicate the "cessation of hostilities" ordinarily would occur prior to the date of the termination of the war. Certainly "cessation of hostilities" would not of itself terminate the state of war. The "cessation of hostilities" might be fixed by an armistice. Thus the armistice between the Allies and the Germans signed on November 11, 1918, provided for a "cessation of hos-

tilities by land and in the air 6 hours after the signing of the armistice" and an "immediate cessation of all hostilities at sea."

However, there is question as to whether an armistice is conclusive evidence of the cessation of hostilities. Judge Learned Hand in *Commercial Cable Co. v. Burleson* (255 Fed. 99, 104-107; S. D. N. Y., 1919), stated: "An armistice effects nothing but a suspension of hostilities; a war still continues. * * * Neither had hostilities ceased. * * * There were still military operations, the armistice had not been carried out, and after it was, armed forces of the United States were in occupation of enemy territory."

The situation surrounding an armistice and cessation of hostilities lends itself to uncertainty and difficulty in determining a date for expiration of legislation contingent upon a cessation of hostilities. This would be particularly true where Congress in the subject legislation provides no method for determining or evidencing of such a cessation. Unless Congress would provide for evidencing of a cessation, such as by proclamation of the President or resolution of the Congress, it would appear inevitable that uncertainty and confusion would ensue.

3. EXPIRING ON TERMINATION OF AN EMERGENCY

Another class of statutes are those effective during any period of national emergency, during the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, or during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941.

In view of the original declaration by the President, it would be logical to look toward him for a proclamation terminating the various emergencies, and thus terminating or suspending the statutory provisions dependent thereon. While it is reasonable to assume that the termination of the emergency period would be coterminous with the termination of the war, such a conclusion would not inevitably follow. For various reasons, the President might consider it desirable to continue the emergency after the termination of the war.

In view of the failure of ratification of the Versailles Treaty such a situation occurred following World War No. 1. The impasse was solved by the joint resolution of March 3, 1921, fixing March 3, 1921, as the date of the termination of the present or existing emergency in the interpretation of any acts of Congress, joint resolutions, or proclamations of the President containing provisions contingent upon the present or existing emergency.

However, doubt existed as to the status of statutes conditional upon the existence of any emergency or national emergency or upon a time of peace. In response to the Secretary of the Navy's inquiry on such statutes, the Attorney General gave his opinion on April 11, 1921 (32 Op. Atty. Gen. 505). In this opinion, the Attorney General held the joint resolution applied to those statutory provisions which in general terms applied to any emergency or national emergency and included the present or existing emergency without specific reference thereto. Likewise the joint resolution affected those statutes relating to the Navy which relate in terms to time of peace, since time of war and time of peace are mutually exclusive. Congress by the joint resolution meant to declare a condition of peace to exist as to the laws of and governing the United States, and hence all laws and regulations depending for their force upon a state of war or emergency were of no further force.

4. EXPIRING ON A DAY CERTAIN

Because of the uncertainty manifest in the afore-mentioned classes of termination clauses, the Congress has resorted increasingly to provisions extending the legislation

for a fixed period (commonly 2 years, although other periods, such as 1 year have been employed).

No difficulty is presented by such provisions in ascertainment of the expiration of statutes containing such provisions.

5. VARIATION OF THE AFORE-MENTIONED CLAUSES WITH PROVISION FOR TERMINATION SUBSEQUENT TO THE BASIC CONTINGENCY

A large number of the statutes under consideration are effective for a fixed period (commonly 6 months, although other periods ranging from 3 to 18 months are also used) after the happening of a specified event. An example of such a provision is "the authority granted in this act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war." Once the basic contingency (i. e., the date of the termination of the war) is determined, the ascertainment of the date of the end of the additional period follows easily by simple calendar computation.

6. PROVISIONS IN THE ALTERNATIVE FOR TERMINATION PRIOR TO THE BASIC CONTINGENCY

Many of the statutes in addition to providing for termination upon the happening of a contingency, also provide for earlier termination as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate. Obviously, the date of such earlier termination, rests in the exercise of the discretion conferred by the specific statute, whether it be the Congress or the President.

The Judge Advocate General's Office is continuing its study of the problem raised by termination clauses with a view to determining what administrative or legislative action may be required in connection with the termination of the war. It is hoped that the foregoing incomplete discussion may prove of value to the Committee, and that you will feel free to call upon the Department for further development of any aspect of this problem or the preparation of legislation in connection therewith.

Sincerely yours,

FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy.

AUGUST 21, 1944.

TEMPORARY LAWS RELATING TO THE NAVY, IN FORCE ON JULY 31, 1944

The following classes of temporary laws are not included in the attached list:

(a) Laws which authorize the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels for the Navy.

(b) Laws which authorize the appropriation of funds for essential equipment and facilities at private or naval establishments for the building and equipping of naval vessels, the alteration and repair of naval vessels, the manufacture of aircraft and aeronautical material, or the production of ordnance and munitions.

(c) Laws which authorize the appropriation of funds for construction of public works.

(d) Miscellaneous provisions contained in acts making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year 1945.

FEDERAL AID FOR POST-WAR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2105) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Consideration of amendments to Senate bill 2105 is in order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads have been giving very careful consideration to the several amendments which were offered to the bill and printed, and have made considerable progress. I was asked by the committee to suggest that if they had a little more time they believe they could bring proposals to the Senate which would be satisfactory to the Senate. I think it would be advisable to allow the committee a little more time, and the Senate, in the meantime, might take up consideration of the calendar or some other business for a while today. Could that be done, I should like to ask the leaders?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it is always in order to call the calendar, but I am wondering whether the members of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, which is now in session, would be interested in the calendar, so that it would be unfair to them to call it in their absence?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, my judgment is that the committee will not complete consideration of the amendments today. There is one other suggestion which I should like to make, to see if it meets with approval. The suggestion is that we dispense with consideration of the road bill today and let it go over until tomorrow or until Friday, which will give the committee ample time to work the matter out, and that the Senate then resume consideration of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President in response to the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona I should say that I believe time would really be saved by giving the committee ample opportunity and time to consider the amendments and to thresh them out. It may be that the committee's report to the Senate would be largely satisfactory to those who have offered the various amendments. We all realize that we have arrived at what may turn out to be the tail end of this session, at least for the present. It is increasingly difficult to keep a quorum in the two Houses of Congress under such conditions. Both sides of the House of Representatives have already entered into an agreement not to transact any other business after the conference reports on the reconversion and surplus property legislation are disposed of. We all know in the Senate how difficult it is to legislate wisely under present conditions.

I am perfectly willing to let the so-called road bill go over until Friday and to have the Senate recess until Friday, but if we can dispose of the calendar today—for many Senators are interested in disposing of the calendar before we shall disperse—I think it ought to be done in the interest of proposed legislation which has been reported to the Senate. I realize, as does the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the difficulty of legislating at all under present conditions. If we cannot call the calendar today in justice to Senators who are not on the floor, or who are in committee, I

feel like stating that we will call it, or attempt to call it, before there is any recess or any adjournment of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. For that matter, we can meet tomorrow for that purpose, or on Friday.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think in the circumstances, there is much merit in the suggestion that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which yesterday was rather committed the task of considering the various proposed amendments, should have further time for the consideration of and for decision with respect to these many amendments. I think probably that in the long run time will be saved by giving the committee time to complete that task now. I should very much dislike to see the calendar called now, without notice to Members of the Senate who are engaged in committee meetings, or who may be on conference committees, and other Senators who are not now in the Chamber. I agree with the distinguished majority leader that some time this week there ought to be a call of the calendar, and that there should be opportunity for disposition of measures on the calendar. However, I hope the Senator from Kentucky will not urge the consideration of measures on the calendar at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not intend to do so. I made the suggestion in the hope that we might save some time by calling the calendar now. However, I do not wish to take advantage of any Senator who is absent.

Let me explain also that, as I understand, the conferees on the surplus-property-disposition bill have practically agreed. They will not be able to formulate their agreement into language in time to take the matter up this week in the other body, where it must be considered first. I believe an effort is being made to have the report ready for consideration in the House next Monday.

The conferees on the reconversion and unemployment-compensation bill, known as the George bill, have practically reached an agreement on all but two items, upon which it is impossible for the conferees to agree. The House conferees have decided to take back to the House those two matters for further consideration on the part of the House, to determine whether the House will instruct its conferees either to yield or to adhere to the House amendment to the George bill. That disposition will also be postponed until Monday or Tuesday. The ability of the conferees on that legislation to get together may or may not depend upon the action of the House regarding the House amendments to the George bill. Whatever the action of the House may be, the conferees will meet again to consider the question. At any rate, we cannot hope to have that matter again before the Senate before early next week.

It is important and essential that Senators remain in Washington, because when either of these conference reports comes before the Senate for considera-

tion, any Senator can demand a yeand-nay vote, or he can demand a quorum. Certainly the Senate is not bereft of a sense of responsibility to a degree which would make it indifferent to the final disposition of this legislation at the earliest possible date. For that reason I am urging, with all the force at my command, that Senators remain in the city, where they will be available, until this legislation is completed. I hope that it will not be necessary to repeat this urging on my part, or on the part of any other Senator, with regard to the importance of this legislation. It would be a serious reflection upon the legislative process if, on measures of this kind, with respect to which all Senators are agreed that it is important to dispose of them as quickly as possible, we should find the Senate not in a position to act.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, because of confusion in the Chamber, I did not hear the statement of the Senator from Kentucky as to the disposition to be accorded Senate bill 2105.

Mr. BARKLEY. The suggestion has been made that the bill go over until Friday.

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret very much that we cannot proceed with the bill today. I cannot be present on Friday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had hoped that we might dispose of the bill today; but the Senator from Arizona, who is in charge of the bill, requests further time for consideration by the committee of the amendments which have been submitted.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am delighted to know that the committee is going further into the question, which needs closer scrutiny. However, it will be impossible for me to be present on Friday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I regret that the Senator, who is one of the ablest legislators in the Senate, finds himself compelled to be absent on any day, and especially on Friday.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for the compliment he pays me. I wish it were deserved. Perhaps it will be impossible to dispose of the bill on Friday, and it may go over until next week.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know about that. If the committee should deal with the amendments in a reasonably satisfactory way, it might be possible to dispose of the bill this week.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee has made considerable progress with respect to the amendments. I am sure that news will be quite pleasing to Senators who have submitted amendments. I believe it will be possible, with the committee giving its attention to the remainder of the amendments, to bring the bill before the Senate and have it considered without substantial opposition.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has the committee considered the advisability of relating a part of the proposed expenditures in some way to the need to afford protection against a condition of unemployment?

Mr. HAYDEN. There was no amendment to that effect pending, and we have not yet reached that question.

The reason why I urged the consideration of the highway bill at this time was that I had been told by Senators interested in the conference reports, which deal with highly controversial matters, as Senators are aware, that it would not be possible to adopt the conference report on either measure—either the George bill relating to reconversion or the surplus-property bill—without having a quorum of the Senate present. That being true, and it being necessary to have a quorum present for those purposes, I thought we might profitably utilize the time in discussion and action upon the highway bill.

The suggestion I should like to make now, and what I should like to have agreed to by unanimous consent, is that if we are to pass the road measure over until Friday, let us have a print of the bill made for the information of the Senate. The print would indicate the changes recommended in the bill by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no disposition to object to the Senator's request. I think it is one which will expedite the proposed legislation. But I should like to inquire whether the Senator thinks the committee is likely to consider any amendment which might in some wise relate some part of this tremendous expenditure to a condition of unemployment in the country. I am now working on an amendment, which I am undertaking to prepare, which would provide for the expenditure of \$200,000,000 a year in any event, but would defer any further expenditures, although the projects could be planned and be made ready for action, dependent upon a condition involving unemployment to the extent of 4,000,000 persons. I hope to furnish to the Senator a copy of the amendment. It is a rather difficult one to draw.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator could do so by tonight—it could be printed at any time—I should be very glad indeed to see that it is brought to the attention of the committee. If it were prepared and printed, I think it would be very helpful in the committee's consideration of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope to have it ready for the committee in a short time.

Mr. HAYDEN. That will be desirable because the committee is sincerely interested in all phases of the matter. We want to report sound legislation which will meet with the approval of all Members of the Senate. After all, the committee is the servant of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the Senator from Arizona or his committee can obtain a committee print without any action on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. I merely wished to make sure that, whatever we did, we would not have to go through a great many papers.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator if there are any amendments before the Senator's committee which is considering the pending bill which would restore the old formula, as we have known it for the past year.

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes; there is an amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd].

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator and his committee giving that amendment the utmost consideration?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is receiving every consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 2509, Calendar No. 1096, a bill for the relief of Marie Engert.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be reported by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2509) for the relief of Marie Engert.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. After further consultation, and at the suggestion of a number of Senators, it seems that we might well proceed now to the call of the calendar. In doing so, we would reach the bill to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. DANAHER. Very well; I withdraw my request.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning at the end of the last call.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, the clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar, beginning at the end of the last call, which is Calendar No. 1047.

Does the Senator from Connecticut desire recognition?

Mr. DANAHER. No, Mr. President. The Senator from Kentucky cleared up the point to which I wished to refer.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Then the clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar, commencing with Calendar No. 1047.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control and for other purposes was announced as first in order.

Mr. WHITE. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1218) to repeal the act of June 18, 1934, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TUNNELL. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

EXEMPTION OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF CRIMINAL CODE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1780) to exempt certain officers

and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 2, line 11, after the word "Board", to insert "or any of its said agencies"; and in line 12, after the word "Board", to insert "or for 90 days thereafter", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That nothing contained in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) shall be deemed to apply to any person heretofore or hereafter appointed to the National War Labor Board or any of its agencies under the authority of the War Labor Disputes Act, any Executive order or regulation issued under the provisions of the act of October 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 765), or Executive Order Numbered 9017, dated January 12, 1942, as amended from time to time, because of intermittent service as a member of the National War Labor Board or of a regional board, industry, commission, tripartite panel or similar agency of the National War Labor Board, or as a hearing officer or arbitrator of such Board, if such person is serving or has served in such capacity without compensation, or with compensation on a per diem when actually employed basis for not in excess of 90 days a year: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of this act shall not apply to any representation before the National War Labor Board or any of its said agencies while such person is an officer or employee of the National War Labor Board or for 90 days thereafter.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2061) to provide a national program for war mobilization and post-war adjustment was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3187) to amend section 5, Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill? If not, I ask that it go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PUNISHMENT OF PERSONS CONSPIRING TO VIOLATE COUNTERFEITING AND OTHER LAWS

The bill (S. 725) to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting, and certain other laws, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 7 of the Criminal Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, ch. 7), is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following section:

"SEC. 178a. If two or more persons conspire to violate any provision of this chapter, or of sections 205, 218, 219, or 220 of chapter 8 of the Criminal Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, ch. 7, and secs. 328, 347, 348, and 349 of ch. 8), or of the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 886; U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, sec. 349a), and one or more of such

persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall, on conviction thereof, be subject to the same fine or imprisonment, or both, as is applicable in the case of conviction for violating such provision."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3592) to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3750) to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the third circuit, and to permit the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAEHER. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ARVO KARI, LEMPI K. HOLM, AND BURT JOHNSTON

The bill (H. R. 2792) for the relief of Arvo Kari, Lempi K. Holm, and Burt Johnston was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. E. S. AXTELL

The bill (S. 1942) for the relief of Dr. E. S. Axtell was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. E. S. Axtell, of Rantoul, Ill., the sum of \$398, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for services rendered the United States Engineer Office, Louisville, Ky., in conducting physical examinations of prospective civilian employees of the United States, such claim having been disallowed by the Comptroller General on the ground that payment for such examinations was not authorized by law: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

DEWEY H. DAVIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1392) for the relief of Dewey H. Davis, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$10,000", and insert "\$5,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dewey H. Davis, of Macon, Ga., the sum of \$5,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as the result of an accident which occurred when the passenger bus in which he was riding was struck by a United

States Army truck near Robins Field, Ga., on July 7, 1943: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GORDON LEWIS COPPAGE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1987) for the relief of Gordon Lewis Coppage, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$4,197.47" and insert "\$1,535.07"; and on page 2, line 2, after the word "expenses", to strike out "and other losses", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gordon Lewis Coppage, of Chicago, Ill., the sum of \$1,535.07, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and damage to personal property sustained by him when the truck which he was driving was struck by a Navy ambulance at the intersection of Bryn Mawr and Central Avenues in Chicago, Ill., on December 4, 1943, and for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses sustained by him as a result of such injuries and damage: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ERNEST A. GROTTKE

The bill (H. R. 3496) for the relief of Ernest A. Grottke was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY HERTZ

The bill (H. R. 527) for the relief of Mary Hertz was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN SALFI

The bill (H. R. 2387) for the relief of John Salfi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRESSIE SPRING AND MRS. HAZEL STUTTE

The bill (H. R. 3033) for the relief of Tressie Spring and Mrs. Hazel Stutte was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. GRACE PAGE

The bill (H. R. 3038) for the relief of Mrs. Grace Page was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

R. GUY DORSEY

The bill (H. R. 3296) for the relief of R. Guy Dorsey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RALPH W. COOLEY

The bill (H. R. 3464) for the relief of Ralph W. Cooley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PERLEY M. SILVER

The bill (H. R. 1708) for the relief of Perley M. Silver was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEOLA EVANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1784) for the relief of Leola Evans, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$3,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Leola Evans, of Columbus, Ga., the sum of \$3,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for the death of her husband, James Evans, who died as a result of injuries sustained by him when a truck driven by him was struck by a United States Army tank at Fort Benning, Ga., on August 21, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALEX WYLIE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1785) for the relief of Alex Wylie, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$1,500" and insert "\$1,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alex Wylie, of Columbus, Ga., the sum of \$1,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when the truck in which he was a passenger was struck by a United States Army tank at Fort Benning, Ga., on August 21, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.

standing. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARTHUR M. SELLERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1732) for the relief of Arthur M. Sellers, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Arthur M. Sellers, of Baxley, Ga., the sum of \$5,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the death of his son, Walter R. Sellers, who died as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when the passenger bus in which he was riding collided with a United States Army vehicle near Alenhurst, Ga., on April 24, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MAMIE DUTCH VAUGHN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1869) for the relief of Mrs. Mamie Dutch Vaughn, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Mamie Dutch Vaughn, of Tattall County, Ga., the sum of \$5,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for the death of her minor daughter, Gladys Vaughn, who was killed on the night of April 23, 1943, in Liberty County, Ga., when the bus on which she was riding was struck by a motor vehicle driven by a soldier in the Army of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. AMY MCKNIGHT

The bill (S. 1959) for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Mrs. Amy McKnight, widow of George McKnight, a former employee of the War Department at Fort Peck, Mont., whose death on February 20, 1936, is alleged to have resulted from pneumonia contracted while in the performance of duty prior to February 12, 1936, and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized to receive and consider her claim under the remaining provisions of the said act: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed within 6 months from the approval of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

HERMAN PHILYAW

The Senate proceed to consider the bill (S. 2008) for the relief of Herman Philyaw which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$1,000" and insert "\$650", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Herman Philyaw, of Tate, Ga., the sum of \$650, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by an Army vehicle as a result of an accident which occurred in Tate, Ga., on January 23, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

C. C. THORNTON

The bill (S. 1766) for the relief of C. C. Thornton was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. C. Thornton, of Walnut, Miss., the sum of \$2,000, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him when the wagon in which he was riding was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck on September 20, 1941, near Walnut, Miss.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor

and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

LUM JACOBS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2007) for the relief of Lum Jacobs, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after "October 2", to strike out "1942" and insert "1943", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lum Jacobs, of Wills Point, Tex., the sum of \$1,030, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him, and for loss of wages because of such injuries, as a result of an accident which occurred when the wagon in which he was riding was struck by an Army vehicle near Wills Point, Tex., on October 2, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOEL A. HART

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1557) for the relief of Joel A. Hart, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$600" and insert "300"; on line 7, to strike out the word "for" and insert "or"; and on line 8, to strike out "being deprived of" and insert "losing", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joel A. Hart, of Milton, Fla., the sum of \$300, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation or damages sustained and expenses incurred by him as a result of his losing the use of his property when he was required to vacate such property pursuant to a notice erroneously served upon him in connection with the condemnation by the United States of certain land in Dixie County, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

W. A. SMOOT, INC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1922) for the relief of W. A. Smoot, Inc., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an

amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$2,417.19" and insert "\$1,210", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. A. Smoot, Inc., Alexandria, Va., the sum of \$1,210. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said W. A. Smoot, Inc., against the United States for damages caused to its lumber and millwork plant located at Cameron and Union Streets, Alexandria, Va., as the result of an explosion on March 2, 1944, in a nearby building used and occupied by the Records Division of The Adjutant General's Office of the Department of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BYRD subsequently said: Mr. President, has Order No. 1083, Senate bill 1922, a bill for the relief of W. A. Smoot, Inc., been passed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was passed.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed be reconsidered, and that the bill be restored to the calendar. I wish to prepare an amendment, and I should like to have the bill remain on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the votes by which the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed are reconsidered, and the bill will be restored to the calendar.

MRS. SOPHIA TANNENBAUM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1897) for the relief of Mrs. Sophia Tannenbaum, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,327.45", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Sophia Tannenbaum, of University City, Mo., the sum of \$5,327.45, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States arising out of the death of her husband, Morris Tannenbaum, who died as the result of injuries sustained by him on February 13, 1943, when a United States Army truck struck another vehicle which struck the said Morris Tannenbaum: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH SCARPELLA AND DOROTHY SCARPELLA

The bill (H. R. 2390) for the relief of Joseph Scarpella and Dorothy Scarpella

was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IRMA S. SHERIDAN

The bill (S. 2069) for the relief of Irma S. Sheridan, postmaster at Rockville, Oreg., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the General Accounting Office is hereby authorized and directed to credit the account of Irma S. Sheridan, postmaster at Rockville, Oreg., in the sum of \$150, representing the amount in which the postmaster's account was disallowed because, through a misunderstanding, the postmaster was authorized to employ the assistant postmaster upon a mail-messenger route at the rate of \$450 per annum, although the act of June 3, 1924 (43 Stat. 356; 39 U. S. C. 579), limits the compensation which may be paid to postmasters, assistant postmasters, and clerks of post offices of the third and fourth classes to \$300 in any 1 year for contract mail-messenger service, it being established that the route is a very difficult one upon which the services of a mail messenger have been exceedingly hard to obtain.

AUTHORITY TO COMPROMISE CERTAIN INDEBTEDNESS

The bill (S. 1688) to authorize the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain indebtedness, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. What is the number of the bill?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is Calendar No. 1087, Senate bill 1688.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I was one of the sponsors of the bill. It is a bill to enable compromise settlements to be made on the old seed and feed loans which were made a number of years ago throughout the country. The bill has been submitted to the Department of Agriculture and has the approval of the Department. It comes to the Senate after approval by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, my request for an explanation was caused by curiosity as to what loans the bill related to, and how far back it would extend. I realize that in connection with some of the old crop seed loans there should be authority to compromise, but I did not desire to have any general power or authority granted to the Farm Credit Administration to compromise obligations. Does the Senator recall the years in which the loans were made?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Offhand, I am unable to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will permit the bill to go over temporarily until I can examine the report of the committee, I shall have no objection to it being called up again.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, this matter came up in the Senate some years ago. I think that if the Senator from Georgia will make an investigation, he will find that the loans were made during the period of drought in 1934 and 1935.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Minnesota is sure that the bill relates only to loans made in those years, I shall have no objection.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I will not say definitely to what it refers, but I presume that the issue is the same as that we had before us some years ago, and the Senate refused to grant authority to compromise or cancel the loans. In my opinion, they should have been canceled a long time ago, because those who suffered in the drought were made destitute, and collectors went into the section of the country where the borrowers lived and grabbed anything they could get. As a matter of fact, there has been a great deal of what amounted almost to persecution in the collection of the old debts. While those affected borrowed money for seed loans, they did not get any crops from the seed. People have written to me that seed loans had accumulated, with interest, amounting to hundreds of dollars, which the Federal Government thought they should pay, while others, who made no loans because they had no farms, were living on relief, and were getting cash to enable them to live, when those who borrowed were trying to raise crops, but could not raise any. I believe that if it is confined to those years, the bill should be passed, but at the moment I cannot say. I have not read the bill for some time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has asked that the bill be passed over temporarily. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

Mr. RUSSELL subsequently said: Mr. President, I have hurriedly examined Senate bill 1688, providing for cancellation of certain indebtedness to the Department of Agriculture. I have no objection to legislation which would provide for the adjustment or cancellation of indebtedness heretofore created. My objection was to conferring any power upon the Secretary of Agriculture to cancel, adjust, or compromise any indebtedness which may be entered into in the future. I believe that it would be very unwise for us to extend any such power.

There is only one provision in the bill which could possibly confer such power. I refer, on page 8, line 20, to the words "or hereafter enacted." If those words were stricken from the bill I would have no objection to the bill being passed.

Mr. President, on page 8, line 20, after the word "heretofore", I wish to offer an amendment, to strike out "or hereafter enacted."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment, but I wish on my own behalf to offer an amendment to the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I wish to have the RECORD show that had we considered the bill I would have offered

an amendment to insert "A complete report to Congress shall be made at intervals of 6 months of all settlements, cancellations, or adjustments authorized by this act."

HENRY WHITE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next bill on the calendar will be stated.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2707) for the relief of Henry White, which had been reported from the Committee on Immigration, with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "States", to insert "Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the Chinese of the first year that the said quota is available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PAUL SZELIGA

The bill (H. R. 2134) for the relief of Paul Szeliga was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FREDA UTLEY

The bill (H. R. 312) for the relief of Freda Utley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940 IN RESPECT TO CERTAIN NATURALIZATION FEES

The bill (H. R. 3722) to amend section 342 of the Nationality Act of 1940 in respect to fees for the issuance of certificates of arrival, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940 IN RESPECT TO COPIES OF RECORDS

The bill (H. R. 1680) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIE ENGERT

The bill (H. R. 2509) for the relief of Marie Engert was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. FRANK K. BOLAND, SR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1853) for the relief of Dr. Frank K. Boland, Sr., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$2,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. Frank K. Boland, Sr., of Atlanta, Ga., the sum of \$2,000,

in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as the result of an accident which occurred when the automobile in which he was riding was struck by a United States Army truck near Mabelton, Ga., on February 11, 1943: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE TO ADMINISTER OATHS, ETC.

The bill (S. 1062) to authorize certain employees of the General Land Office to administer or take oaths, affirmations, affidavits, or depositions in the performance of their official duties, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the authority to administer or take oaths, affirmations, affidavits, or depositions, whenever necessary in the performance of their official duties, is hereby granted to field examiners and other employees of the General Land Office designated by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, Department of the Interior, for that purpose.

MOORES CREEK NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

The bill (H. R. 3384) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept property for the Moores Creek National Military Park, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CREDIT IN CERTAIN HOMESTEAD ENTRIES FOR MILITARY OF NAVAL SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 5025) to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War No. 2, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF DULUTH, MINN.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1807) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Duluth, Minn., which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 3, line 4, after the word "meridian", to strike out "Provided, That the land authorized to be conveyed hereunder shall be used for the construction of and be maintained as a public highway free of any expense to the United States, and all work thereon shall be such as not to interfere with the operations and efficiency of the fisheries station and in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further, That in the event of*

the discontinuance by the city of Duluth of the use of the above-described property as a public highway or the failure to maintain same in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior, the title of said land shall revert to the United States" and insert "The said conveyance to the city of Duluth shall be made subject to the conditions that the land be used for the construction of and maintenance of a public highway free of any expense to the United States, that the highway be constructed and maintained so as not to interfere with the operations of and access to the fish hatchery station, and that in the event of the discontinuance by the city of Duluth of the use of the above-described property as a public highway, or upon failure to maintain the same in accordance with the conditions of the deed, title to said land shall revert to the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 2, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall affect the applicability of the Federal Highway Act, approved November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), as amended, to the public highway to be constructed on the land authorized to be conveyed hereunder.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the city of Duluth, Minn., the following-described land, now a part of the fisheries station in said city: Beginning at a point on the east line of Sixtieth Avenue East in the city of Duluth, State of Minnesota, said point lying forty-three and four one-hundredths feet in a northerly direction from a point at the intersection of the center line of London Road, extended with the said east line of Sixtieth Avenue East; thence extending in an easterly direction at an angle of sixty-six degrees and fifteen minutes to the left of said east line of Sixtieth Avenue East a distance of sixty-one and fifty-seven one-hundredths feet to a point of curve; thence continuing on a curve to the left whose radius is one thousand three hundred and forty-five and seven-tenths feet a distance of three hundred and sixty-four and eighteen one-hundredths feet, to the center line of Lester River as now located; thence in a southeasterly direction along the center line of said Lester River a distance of one hundred and thirty-two and thirty-six one-hundredths feet to a point; thence westerly parallel to the curve above described and distant therefrom one hundred and twenty feet, a distance of one hundred and seventy-eight and twenty one-hundredths feet to a point; thence northerly on a radial line a distance of eight and five-tenths feet to a point; thence westerly parallel to the curve first above described and distant therefrom one hundred and eleven and five-tenths feet a distance of two hundred and seventy-eight and ten one-hundredths feet to a point of tangency; thence westerly on a tangent line a distance of twelve and fifty-one one-hundredths feet to a point on the east line of Sixtieth Avenue East; thence northerly on said east line of Sixtieth Avenue East a distance of one hundred and twenty-one and eighty-two one-hundredths feet to a point of beginning and there terminating, containing an area of one and one-hundred-and-seventy-six one-thousandths acres; said land being located in sections 5 and 8, town-

ship 50 north, range 13 west, of the fourth principal meridian. The said conveyance to the city of Duluth shall be made subject to the conditions that the land be used for the construction of and maintenance of a public highway free of any expense to the United States, that the highway be constructed and maintained so as not to interfere with the operations of and access to the fish hatchery station, and that in the event of the discontinuance by the city of Duluth of the use of the above-described property as a public highway, or upon failure to maintain the same in accordance with the conditions of the deed, title to said land shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall affect the applicability of the Federal Highway Act, approved November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), as amended, to the public highway to be constructed on the land authorized to be conveyed hereunder.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN OIL AND GAS LEASES

The bill (S. 2111) to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask if the bill in any way refers to the Elk Hills or Teapot Dome area?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no. It deals only with 5-year leases. The purpose of the bill is to afford an additional year's time to operators who have complied with the law but have not yet brought in necessary production.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence in the first section of the act entitled "An act to grant a preference right to certain oil and gas leases," approved July 29, 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The term of any 5-year lease expiring prior to December 31, 1945, maintained in accordance with the applicable statutory requirements and regulations and for which no preference right to a new lease is granted by this section, is hereby extended to December 31, 1945."

FEES AND COSTS IN CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1569) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes," approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 536; 28 U. S. C. 543), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 2, line 5, after the word "appeals", to insert "and in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

FEES IN DISTRICT COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill (H. R. 1623) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts

of the United States," approved February 11, 1925 (43 Stat. 857), as amended (28 U. S. C., secs. 548-555), was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE BY MEMBERS OF THE NAVY WOMEN'S RESERVE

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate bill 2028, and I submit a report (No. 1089) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2028) to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, so as to permit foreign service of members of the Women's Reserve under certain conditions.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement with regard to the bill.

The bill relates to foreign service of the WAVES. There has been a great deal of controversy on the subject because of differences between members of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives, and members of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate. The Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives has recommended granting to the Women's Auxiliary of the Navy—the WAVES—the right of foreign service in the European area. The Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate has expressed its opposition to granting to the WAVES the right of foreign service in the European area on the ground that there is only one major naval station where the WAVES could be used, and that a great deal of expense would be involved, and considerable trouble would be experienced in providing adequate quarters for the WAVES in London. The Navy is different from the Army in that its activities are at sea, while the activities of the Army are confined to land. The fact that the WAC's have been granted permission to be sent to any part of the world has led to a movement on the part of those interested in the WAVES to be given like permission. As a result of this discussion and controversy, or difference of opinion, a compromise has been reached by the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House, due to a special request made by the Navy Department which I will read with the permission of the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, would the Senator mind my asking him a question at that point?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts if the service of the WAVES on foreign duty is to be purely voluntary?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The bill provides that they may not be sent to Hawaii without their consent.

Mr. MAYBANK. In other words, such service would be purely voluntary.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Committee on Naval Affairs were informed that Admiral Nimitz, the commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet and the Pacific Ocean area, stated that 332 male officers and 4,906 male enlisted personnel could be relieved by women in the Hawaiian Islands, and that the male personnel so relieved could be immediately made available for sea duty or for duty on the small islands and atolls in this area. The committee understand that housing and other facilities for the accommodation of the members of the Women's Reserve are available in the Hawaiian area.

Since members of the Women's Reserve were enrolled on the assumption that they would not be assigned to duty beyond the continental limits of the United States, the committee feel that they should not now be so assigned without their consent, and have provided in the bill that they may be assigned to duty at naval stations outside the continental limits of the United States but in the American area, and in the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, only upon their prior consent.

This bill merely responds to the appeal made to the committee by the Navy Department, and provides that members of the Women's Reserve may, under the direction of the Navy Department, be sent to the Hawaiian area.

I note that the Senator from Iowa has risen and probably desires to ask me a question. If he does I shall be glad to yield to him.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. As he knows, there was in the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate a strong majority opinion in opposition to the proposal to authorize or allow foreign service for members of the Women's Reserve. As the Senator also knows, the Department has from time to time changed its viewpoint as presented to the Naval Affairs Committee. It was not long ago that request was made that we approve legislation to allow sending the WAVES to the European area. Now I understand that Department has taken another position and is willing to have the service limited to the Hawaiian area, and I further understand that the amendment which is to be offered by the chairman of the committee provides that service in Hawaii and in the Western Hemisphere shall be voluntary. The chairman of the committee also is well aware that members of the House committee have taken a different viewpoint, and have insisted that the doors be thrown wide open to foreign service.

I may say, Mr. President, to the distinguished chairman of the committee that I am not disposed to oppose the amendment as presented, if the chairman of the committee, within the limits of course of his position, can give us any assurance that it will not be thrown out in conference committee between the two Houses.

If assurance can be given that the amendment will be accepted, I should like to have him give such assurance if he can.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The distinguished Senator from Iowa has expressed the views on this subject of a large majority of the Committee on Naval Affairs. As he has well stated, there has been a strong feeling in the committee that the WAVES should be confined to service in continental United States, and that a sufficiently strong case was not made for sending them abroad, for the reasons I have given. There has been a good deal of feeling that the WAVES should have the same legislation that the WAC's have, but there has been lack of understanding or failure to appreciate that the naval service is primarily sea service. Except in very rare instances no man can be accepted for service in the Navy who is not able to go to sea, who cannot go to sea, and who is not willing to go to sea. So there is a different situation in the case of the WAVES than that which prevails in the case of the WAC's.

Now let me answer the question. I know the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] feels as the Senator from Iowa and others feel. The final compromise was reached after a meeting between the acting chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House, myself, and the Secretary of the Navy; and it is my understanding that when this bill is passed with the amendment now proposed the Naval Affairs Committee of the House will recommend its adoption without going to conference on the amendment. That would dispose of the objection which the distinguished Senator from Iowa had and which I myself had.

Now why should this bill be passed at the present time? During the past week the Secretary of the Navy has appealed to me at least three times about this bill. The House will meet in all probability only on one day when legislation of this kind may be considered before a recess is taken, and that will be on Monday. That is why it is important to take action now on the bill.

I want to say that I think the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs have been very considerate and have tried to go a long way to meet the wishes of the Navy Department, although there have been very strong feelings in opposition to legislation permitting WAVES to go outside the United States.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. ANDREWS. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee if there is an estimate of the number that would be required?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Admiral Nimitz states that 332 male officers and 4,906 male enlisted personnel can be relieved by sending members of the Women's Reserve to the Hawaiian Islands, and I assume the same number of members of the Women's Reserve would be sent to take the place of the officers and enlisted personnel who would be assigned to other duty elsewhere.

That number, I understand, would be the maximum.

Mr. ANDREWS. There is one question I have raised to which I think no reference has been made. I believe it to be conceded that naval operations in the Atlantic have been carried on to a greater extent than anywhere else in the world. In view of the present situation in Europe, if Germany should be defeated within the next few weeks, the personnel of the Navy in the Atlantic would be in such position that a number of men could be spared, because there would be no more fighting in the Atlantic, and it has occurred to me that they could well be used in the Pacific.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That has been thought of and considered by the Navy and by the Committees on Naval Affairs. In my opinion, it will be many days before there will be a reduction in the personnel of the Navy, notwithstanding the ending of the war in Europe. The officers and men of the Navy who are now serving in the Atlantic will be immediately transferred to the Pacific. The Navy Department represents to me that notwithstanding the situation suggested by the Senator from Florida, the Women's Reserve are needed in Hawaii. I know the Department appreciates the Senator's views and the views of other members of the committee, and I think they should be commended for making a compromise of their original views in order to comply with the pressing request of the Navy Department.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks I ask that the report submitted by the committee on the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The report (No. 1089) is as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2028) to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, so as to permit foreign service of members of the Women's Reserve under certain conditions, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

Members of the Women's Reserve established under the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 and the Women's Reserve established under the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, are restricted to the performance of duty within the continental limits of the United States. They may not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or the Coast Guard, or on combat aircraft.

The purpose of the present bill, as amended by the committee, is to modify existing restrictions so as to permit their assignment to duty in the American area and in the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

The committee were informed that Admiral Nimitz, commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean area, states that 332 male officers and 4,906 male enlisted personnel can be relieved by women in the Hawaiian Islands, and that the male personnel so relieved could be immediately made available for sea duty, or for duty on the small islands and atolls in this area. The committee understand that housing and other facilities for the accommodation of the members of the Women's Reserve are available in the Hawaiian area.

Since members of the Women's Reserve were enrolled on the assumption that they

would not be assigned to duty beyond the continental limits of the United States, the committee feel that they should not now be so assigned without their consent, and have provided in the present bill that they may be assigned to duty at naval stations outside the continental limits of the United States but in the American area, and in the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, only upon their prior consent.

Attached hereto, and made a part of this report, is a letter addressed to the chairman of the committee by the Secretary of the Navy, dated September 5, 1944:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, September 5, 1944.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Senate Naval Affairs Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In my letter to you dated June 22, 1944, I expressed my interest in the legislation to remove the present provision of law which restricts members of the Women's Reserve to shore duty within the continental limits of the United States.

A recent communication from Admiral Nimitz, commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas, discloses that the replacement of 332 male officers and 4,906 male enlisted personnel can be effected in the Hawaiian Islands if this proposal should become a law. The male personnel could immediately be made available for sea duty and for duty on the small islands and atolls.

In the event of enactment of this legislation it is my intention that members of the Women's Reserve not be assigned to duty in Europe. Also, I should like to reiterate my assurance to you that WAVES will not be ordered outside the continental United States until adequate housing facilities are available for them prior to their departure, and that each such assignment will be on a voluntary basis. These assurances are already set forth in the printed hearings.

The Navy Department believes that removal of the aforementioned restriction is essential to the war effort, and in the consideration of S. 2028 by your committee I urgently recommend favorable action thereon in the interest of the entire Naval Establishment.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the details of this proposed legislation, but I have an understanding that it comes before the Senate in amended form as a result of compromise efforts of the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And in conjunction with the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. WHITE. It comes before the Senate with the approval of the naval authorities, I take it to be?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Absolutely; not only with their approval but with their urgent request for action.

Mr. WHITE. I think I am justified in saying that I think it comes here with the approval of some members at least of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. We all have to accustom ourselves to the acceptance of compromises in legislative bodies. I would go much further than the proposed legislation goes, but I think it would be a calamity not to accept the compromise in the spirit in which it is offered, and I hope very much that the bill will be passed.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs whether the bill, while it provides that members of the WAVES cannot be sent to Hawaii without their consent, would relate to new enlistees or inductees. Would they be obliged to go?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. In my judgment, they would be. Those who have enlisted up to this time enlisted with the understanding that their services would be confined to the continent of the United States. From now on they would understand that they might be sent to Hawaii.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator feel this would not have an adverse effect on future enlistments?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. There is a two-sided judgment on that question. Many think that the fact that we have a statute preventing the sending of WAVES outside the continent has been helpful to enlistments; and, indeed, the enlistment record of the Navy Women's Auxiliary has been much better than that of the Army Auxiliary. Others say that there would have been more enlistments. So it is a disputed question.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator for his opinion in the matter.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be considered.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2028) to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, so as to permit foreign service of members of the Women's Reserve under certain conditions, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 504 of title V—Women's Reserve, of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, added by the act entitled "An act to expedite the war effort by releasing officers and men for duty at sea and their replacement by women in the Shore Establishment of the Navy, and for other purposes," approved July 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 730; U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. III, title 34, sec. 857c), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 504. Members of the Women's Reserve shall not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or in aircraft while such aircraft are engaged in combat missions and shall not be assigned to duty outside the American area and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and may be assigned to duty outside the continental United States only upon their prior request."

SEC. 2. Section 404 of title IV—Women's Reserve, of the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as added by the act entitled "An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to expedite the war effort by providing for releasing officers and men for duty at sea, and their replacement by women in the Shore Establishment of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved November 23, 1942 (56 Stat. 1020; U. S. C. 1940 ed., Supp. III, title 14, sec. 384), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 404. Members of the Women's Reserve shall not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or Coast Guard or in aircraft while such aircraft are engaged in combat missions and shall not be assigned to duty outside the American area and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and may be

assigned to duty outside the continental United States only upon their prior request."

SEC. 3. As used in this act the term "American area" means the area geographically defined as follows:

"East boundary—From the North Pole, south along the seventy-fifth meridian west longitude to the seventy-seventh parallel north latitude, thence southeast through Davis Strait to the intersection of the fortieth parallel north latitude and the thirty-fifth meridian west longitude, thence south along that meridian to the tenth parallel north latitude, thence southeast to the intersection of the equator and the twentieth meridian west longitude, thence along the twentieth meridian west longitude to the South Pole.

"West boundary—From the North Pole, south along the one hundred and forty-first meridian west longitude to the east boundary of Alaska, thence south and southeast along the Alaskan boundary to the Pacific Ocean, thence south along the one hundred and thirtieth meridian to its intersection with the thirtieth parallel north latitude, thence southeast to the intersection of the equator and the one hundredth meridian west longitude, thence south along the one hundredth meridian west longitude to the South Pole."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, and the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to permit service of members of the Women's Reserves in the American area, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and for other purposes."

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, September 15, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 13 (legislative day of September 1), 1944:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Leland Olds to be a member, Federal Power Commission, for the term expiring June 22, 1949.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Howard F. Houk to be United States attorney for the district of New Mexico.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Benjamin J. McKinney to be United States marshal for the district of Arizona.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

Fred D. Lewis, Jr., to be temporary dental surgeon, effective September 1, 1944.

Leon A. Heppel to be temporary passed assistant surgeon, effective August 1, 1944.

Robert J. Huebner to be temporary passed assistant surgeon, effective August 1, 1944.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Clark H. Lewis, Tiger.

ARKANSAS

Madia B. Adams, Austin.
John H. Long, Donaldson.

Bertha Clinton Cragar, Grannis.
Charles E. Watson, Greenway.
Monroe K. Churchill, Hector.
Clarence U. Price, London.
Samuel E. Adkisson, Mount Vernon.
Bland F. Bryant, Success.
Charles A. Affholter, Vandervoort.

FLORIDA

Rex O. Simmons, Bascom.
Alice W. Martin, Bay Pines.
Percival L. Buzbee, Gibsonton.
Irene E. Culbreth, Jennings.
Janet E. Barr, Limona.
Robert G. Wood, Jr., Lithia.
Varena M. Cox, Montverde.
Frances Graham, Naranja.
Bert Emberton, Port Tampa.
Marvin A. Thomason, Produce.

ILLINOIS

Carter H. Pietsch, Bloomington.
Veneta L. Moss, Dakota.
Harley R. Foster, Deer Creek.
Ivory Bunch, McClure.
Bertha M. Esh, Spring Grove.
Jennie Puma, Thayer.
Thomas J. Gawthorp, West Salem.

IOWA

Charles D. Burns, Marion.
Warren W. Fulton, Selma.

LOUISIANA

John A. Ludwig, Grand Isle.

MINNESOTA

Lawrence J. Voight, Clara City.
Olive M. Stromgren, Constance.
Norman C. Worden, Erhard.
Heziakah H. Wood, Freeborn.
Edward J. Garrity, McGrath.

MISSISSIPPI

Roy E. Hussey, Abbeville.
Lina B. Dietz, Beaumont.
Jesse H. Seale, Big Creek.
Annette Boleware, Carson.
Mary Bloodworth, Cascilla.
Albert P. Henry, Darling.
Edith M. Hattox, Ecu.
Eva D. Hill, Elliott.
Jimmie L. Coffey, Etta.
James E. Rogers, Falkner.
Sarah F. Myers, Handsboro.
Honor A. Patterson, Hub.
Earl J. Lake, Maud.
Stella M. Lewis, McLain.
Carrie B. Carter, McLaurin.
Taylor D. Buntin, Nesbitt.
Mattie B. Bounds, Overt.
Benjamin C. Felgler, Philipp.
Willie G. Rogers, Plantersville.
Edna E. Forbes, Sandy Hook.
Vanle S. Cox, Sarah.
Lee R. Adams, Sweetman.
William George Knight, Sr., Taylor.
James J. Craig, Tillatoba.
Oleane Wright, Tremont.
Hilda P. Toombs, Walls.

NORTH DAKOTA

Gertrude E. Kraus, Alice.
Edward Jerke, Fredonia.
Esther N. Overn, Kathryn.
Vaughn C. Magnuson, Martin.
Benjamin J. Schnedar, Pisek.

OKLAHOMA

Clefford F. Vickroy, Frederick.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Brendan A. Keane, Stephan.
Agnes C. Maroney, Winfred.

TEXAS

Ben F. Brooks, Bagwell.
Gaynell Bond, Donle.
Luther M. Dye, Graford.
Charles Smart, Lone Oak.
Charles M. Bollinger, Powderly.
Charles E. Turner, Smithfield.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker. The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, merciful God, for all our days, laden with spiritual benedictions and influences. Let the fretful and questioning heart say with the Psalmist: "Return unto thy rest, O my soul, for the Lord hath dealt bountifully with thee. I will pay my vows unto Him in the presence of all the people and will walk before the Lord in the land of the living." In Thy blessings enable us to profit in knowledge, strength, and courage.

Through self-revelation, Heavenly Father, show us a vision of the new and better life in which shall be arrested the unmastered tendencies of our hearts and unfetter the entanglements of temptation. Forgive the meagerness of our obedience and sacrifice; we plead for more faith, for a more resolute spirit that shall defeat the barriers and besetments to true manhood and womanhood. O deliver us from the enthrallments of the solitary and selfish life which so often teems with delusions and false estimates. We would pray for the wondrous virtue of Thy spirit with directive energy that frames the soul with abounding grace and power. We ask Thee "for a present mind intent on pleasing Thee." Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1434. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kohler.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2137. An act to provide for naming the lake formed by waters of the Red River impounded by Denison Dam; and

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution making an appropriation to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1945.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Labor.
2. Department of the Navy.

3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Post Office Department.
5. Federal Security Agency.
6. Interstate Commerce Commission.
7. National Archives.
8. Office of Price Administration.
9. Railroad Retirement Board.
10. War Food Administration.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House today, after other special orders, for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

TO AMEND THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4271) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "six" and insert "five."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this amendment?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. MASON. This amendment which the Senate has placed upon this bill simply cuts the 2-year extension which the House provided in the bill to 1 year to maintain their citizenship. That is all it does.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO EXPATRIATE OR EXCLUDE CERTAIN PERSONS FOR EVADING MILITARY AND NAVAL SERVICE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4257) to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "(1)" and insert "(j)."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from New York explain the Senate amendment?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill was passed by the House after it had been unanimously reported by the committee. The purpose of the bill is to

keep out of the country certain people who evaded war service and left this country after Pearl Harbor, especially most of them having left after the declaration by the President and the Congress of a state of war. This bill will keep them out and they will not be given a change to come back. They are of military age.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I may say that the Senate amendment simply changes the number of the paragraph from "1" to "j."

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is all.

Mr. MASON. That is all it does.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is all; but I thought my colleague wanted to know something about the bill itself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made on the 30th day of August last by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] before the Rotary Club of White Sulphur Springs, Mont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article from the Knoxville Journal about a marine combat correspondent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech I delivered in Staunton, Va., on yesterday before the service clubs of that city entitled "Some Problems of a Lasting Peace."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 4715 and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article by James Morgan that appeared in the Boston Globe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution just passed by the National Association of County Officials. Coming as it does from local units in the State it must have some interest to the Nation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today at the conclusion of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table and other special orders I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE OLEO TRUST

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in its vain attempt to promote the concoction known as oleo the Oleo Trust issued a four-page spread, each page 18 inches by 23 inches, which arrived in our offices today. The heading is "Newspapers rally support for margarine bill." There are comments from various newspapers.

However, the Oleo Trust in its attempt to show the newspaper support for oleo made one serious mistake; it included the following editorial from the Shelbyville (Ky.) News of June 22, 1944.

The editorial from the Shelbyville (Ky.) News is as follows:

THE OLEO FIGHT AFFECTS US TOO

The local dairy industry, which represents an important cog in the whole milk production machine, has shown only mild concern over the oleo fight in Congress. The view perhaps has been that it is somebody else's fight and won't directly affect the average producer of milk. Yet the outcome of proposed legislation in the present battle could undermine the whole milk price system.

By forcing the price of butter down, the oleo manufacturers would devalue the basic

element of the milk industry—the price of butterfat.

At the Washington hearings on the Smith bill, it has been disclosed that oleo manufacture is in the hands of 18 or 20 companies.

The present proposal would take the Federal 10-cent tax off colored oleo. It would change the name of oleomargarine to margarine and permit manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine with the payment of only ¼ cent a pound. The bill is championed by Senator ELLISON D. "COTTON ED" SMITH, with the aid of the southern cottonseed oil interests.

Similar proposals have been defeated many times since the first tax went on oleo in 1886, but each time the battle gets hotter.

Dairying is the most important year around source of income for Shelby County. The fight of the dairy interests in Washington should have at least the undivided moral support of this area.

If this editorial from the Shelbyville (Ky.) News is an example of the "Newspapers rally support for the margarine bill," it is hoped that the Oleo Trust will print and distribute more of this kind.

The Shelbyville (Ky.) News shows a deep understanding of the question involved. This paper realizes and calls attention to the threat to the whole dairy industry. Surely under normal times about 42 pounds out of every 100 pounds of milk produced was made into butter, 5 pounds diverted into ice cream, 5 pounds diverted into cheese, 5 pounds diverted to evaporated milk, 30 pounds sold as fluid milk, and the remainder of the 100 pounds fed to calves and wasted. This editorial realizes that once you allow vegetable oils to replace animal fats in butter by removing the protective Federal legislation the next step is to remove the protective Federal legislation enjoyed by the evaporated and condensed milk industry with filled milk replacing the condensed milk, that the next step is to remove the protective Federal legislation enjoyed by the cheese industry, with the result that filled cheese will replace natural full-cream cheese.

All the oleo is being and has been made that the Oleo Trust could make with the oil allocated to the industry by the War Production Board. No one objects to anyone eating all the oleo wanted, but the dairymen want oleo sold as oleo and for what it is, and not as butter.

Remember the testimony of Dr. E. B. Hart, one of the greatest living scientists, before the Senate Agriculture Committee in June 1944. I quote:

In the present state of our knowledge, it is preposterous—let me repeat that—in the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous for any scientist to make the blank statement that it is proven that oleomargarine or vegetable oils have an equivalence to butterfat in nutrition.

According to the dictionary the definition of the word "preposterous" is as follows:

Contrary to nature, reason, or common sense; strikingly or utterly absurd or impracticable.

The Shelbyville (Ky.) News is to be complimented for its keen insight into the threat to the dairy industry. Why is it oleo has not had a dollars-and-cent ceiling? Why has oleo been selling for 17 to 29 cents per pound? Why has the present administration been able to

fix dollars-and-cents ceilings even on skim-milk products and not on oleo?

DR. JOHN COMPTON BALL

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 7, I brought to the attention of the House briefly the history of the Lutheran Church of the Reformation in Washington and the great work of this church and its pastor, Dr. Blackwelder. Today I am calling your attention to another historic event in the religious life of our Capital City.

Dr. John Compton Ball, pastor of Metropolitan Baptist Church, located at Sixth and A Streets NE., a little more than a stone's throw from the Capitol, is the only living minister who has opened the House with prayer under nine different Speakers, beginning with Speaker "Uncle Joe" Cannon and on down to our present Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN.

On Sunday, September 10, 1944, Dr. Ball preached his farewell sermon, having requested retirement at the end of his forty-first year as pastor at Metropolitan Church, at the age of 81.

On Friday night, September 15, 1944, Dr. Ball's congregation is tendering him a reception. Invitations have gone out to the clergy of Washington as well as many friends and acquaintances of Dr. Ball.

Metropolitan Baptist Church extends to the Members of the Congress an invitation to attend the reception, 8 p. m., Friday, September 15.

Dr. Ball was born in Northamptonshire, England, in 1863, came to America at the age of 7, attended public schools in Philadelphia, was employed by John Wanamaker until entering the ministry, attended Temple College and obtained his doctor of divinity degree from that university, was graduated from Corzier Theological Seminary in 1899. He became pastor of Metropolitan Baptist Church September 1, 1903. His ministry there has been uninterrupted.

This church now has a membership of 3,000. Its growth has been phenomenal, due largely to the faithful work of this devout, outstanding man of God. His life, his ministry, and his leadership have done great things for the spiritual, moral, and civic uplift of Washington, and I am sure we all wish for Dr. Ball in his retirement many years yet of usefulness, health, and happiness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of Sunday, September 3, 1944, entitled "M. V. A. Is Not the Answer."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two articles, which appeared in the Weekly K. A. P. Review, one concerning the Most Reverend Francis J. Spellman, archbishop of New York, who is at present touring the various military posts in Europe as military vicar of the United States armed forces, and the other one concerning the Most Reverend Thomas O'Shea, archbishop of Wellington, and Bishop Herbert Holland of the Church of England.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article which appeared in the morning Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a statement by Mr. Hannegan, in which he brands a story appearing in the press as untrue.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXPENSES OF THE INAUGURAL CEREMONIES OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES ON JANUARY 20, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table (S. J. Res. 150) making an appropriation to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1945, and for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000, to enable the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1945, in accordance with such program as may be adopted by the joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, appointed under the concurrent resolution of the two Houses agreed to June

23, 1944, including the pay for extra police, fiscal year 1945.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that this resolution is the customary resolution; that it is identical in language with resolutions heretofore adopted with the sole exception that the sum provided instead of being \$35,000 as heretofore is reduced to \$25,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is the stereotyped resolution which has always passed in anticipation of the President's inauguration. It is, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, identical with the resolution passed 4 years ago, with the exception that instead of appropriating \$35,000 as they did then, the appropriation is for \$25,000 this year. Of course, as the House understands, this amount is used almost exclusively for the building of stands, and it was anticipated that they could make a saving this year of \$10,000, by providing less space on account of travel conditions which are expected to limit the attendance at the inaugural ceremonies.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. This amount was determined by the special committee?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. The special committee, which met last Friday, I believe, approved the sum, and also directed the introduction of the resolution. A resolution of this character, of course, originates usually in the House, but, in this instance, the chairman of the Inaugural Committee being a Member of the Senate, it originated in the Senate.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] is a member of that committee?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman was present at that meeting?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] is a member of the committee, and was present at the time, and approved the resolution authorizing the introduction of this joint resolution passed by the Senate and now on the Speaker's table.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the committee on the reduction of the appropriation. I am sure that Mr. Dewey will not want an ostentatious inauguration. He will want no expense other than that which is actually necessary, and that all appropriations be used for the things for which the country needs money so badly.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Roosevelt has been through the experience before, and in keeping with his usual economical management would, I am certain, favor the reduction in the amount at this time. The general public is never as interested in a repeat performance.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman said the President favored the reduction. Has the President been interviewed as to the amount of money that is going

to be appropriated for the inauguration of Mr. Dewey?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The resolution passed by the committee provided that the two candidates for the Presidency should be consulted.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of what the gentleman said about Mr. Roosevelt having gone through the experience so often, it would seem to me you would not need an appropriation at all, if you expected his inauguration to take place, because you could use one of those old stands used by him; build it of second-hand lumber. But that is not the thing I am worrying about. The thing that worries me is: Are we going to continue to meet here from day to day without a quorum, with just a few present, and deal with legislation? Are you going to keep us here indefinitely while waiting for these conference reports? Some of us have business to attend to at home. This administration has gotten our folks into such a situation that they want to know what we are going to do to relieve them. What I want to know is how long are we going to be kept here dallying along instead of passing important legislation or going home and give attention to that portion of our work.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is always a quorum available.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is always a quorum available?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If that is so, I will make the point of order that a quorum is not present to find out if the gentleman is correct. The gentleman knows there is not a quorum in town.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman may exercise that constitutional prerogative at any time. There is always a constructive quorum present and there is one here this morning.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We are not doing anything except wasting more time and money.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I know the gentleman would not want to go home and leave important legislation pending.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I still reserve the right to object. Why do we not get about that important business?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As has been announced by both party whips, I understand that the conference report on the surplus property bill will be before the House on Monday, and the conferees on the George bill will also be before the House Monday or Tuesday. For further information, I refer the gentleman to his own leader, who can give him the information he requires.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Some of us do not have the benefit of that \$2,000,000 Sidney Hillman slush fund with which he expects to buy the next Congress. Some of us have to get home and find out what our folks want us to do about that. We do not have anything to do with the spending of that money. He is spending it for the election of a Congress which he can control.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of asking the majority leader as to the program for the rest of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. There will be no legislative program for the remainder of the week.

I am informed that the conferees on the bill relating to the disposition of surplus property have agreed, and it is expected that the conference report on that bill will be brought up Monday.

The conferees on the other bill will come back to the House for instructions on two specific questions: One, whether or not Federal employees shall be included in the bill, and the other on the question of travel allowance.

It is the intention to bring up both of these matters on Monday. It is not the intention to bring up any other legislation thereafter except that which can be disposed of by unanimous consent.

Mr. MICHENER. As far as the bill from the Committee on Ways and Means is concerned, the procedure on Monday then will probably be to have an hour's debate on each of the controversial proposals?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my understanding that under the rules that would be the limit, unless a longer time for debate is allowed by unanimous consent, and I have no knowledge of any such intention. As to the order in which they will be brought up, I do not know whether the report of the conferees on the George bill will come up before the conference report on the surplus property bill, but they are both scheduled for Monday, and it is the intention of the leadership to bring them up Monday.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. May I ask the majority leader with reference to the road bill. I see that the Senate yesterday decided to take up a road bill. Does not that mean that if the Senate should pass it we will get it?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no definite knowledge as to what the Senate has decided to do, but what knowledge I have had about it is in substantial agreement with the understanding of the gentleman from Ohio. For the benefit of the Members of the House I may say that assuming the Senate does act favorably upon that bill, it is not the intention to take up the road bill in this body before

the election, but it is the intention that the bill shall be taken up after election day and before the termination of this session. The leaders on both sides are in agreement in that respect. I believe my friend from Michigan will agree that after the election we must take up that bill and dispose of it, because the legislatures of the several States meet next year and many of them have a constitutional time limit.

There are certain provisions of the bill which have to be acted upon by the several State legislatures. It is an obligation and a duty and it is only right. So far as I am concerned, I make the statement that the bill will be brought up after election.

Mr. JENKINS. That is the reason I brought it up. Everybody recognizes that it is very important legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no question about it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement on the Chinese situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

BUTTER SHORTAGE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the present shortage of butter which threatens to remove this nutritious dairy product from the diet in large consuming areas, is primarily due to the stupidity in O. P. A. policies during the past 3 years.

Greater O. P. A. price ceilings for fluid milk used for manufacturing purposes, outside of butter, has drastically cut cream supplies for butter production. Butter supplies in the coming 6 months will be from 12 percent to 25 percent less than in 1943. Due to increased labor and feed cost, dairy farmers have been forced to divert milk sales from cream for butter into fluid milk for other uses. A farmer can receive at least 50 cents more per hundred pounds for his fluid milk, under present regulations, than if he sold his cream for butter.

The War Food Administration is anxious to get more butter and so are the people. And I want to urge the O. P. A. and the W. F. A. to promptly get together and establish proper compensatory price regulations to increase butter production and also provide an adequate supply of milk for other purposes.

It also appears to me that certain officials and interests might not be adverse to the idea of encouraging the butter shortage in order to increase the use of oleomargarine. Five million dairy farmers are fully conscious of what is being done to them in this respect.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record in one instance, and include a newspaper editorial, and in the second instance to extend my own remarks by including a brief address by a former Member of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I make two unanimous consent requests, one to insert in the Record a short poem and the other to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein nine affidavits with reference to election frauds in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

CROP INSURANCE

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK], has pointed out that following the general election it is the intention to bring up for consideration the road bill. There is a measure which has been voted out and which has been on the calendar. A rule has been granted on it. It has been endorsed by both of the great political parties. That is a measure concerning crop insurance. I am anxious to learn whether or not it is the intention of the leadership to let the crop-insurance bill come along immediately following the road bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's question, and in light of the fact that the rule has been granted on the bill, as I am informed by the gentleman from Georgia, may I say that the bill will come up after election. It is an important bill. I make a definite statement and promise that the bill will come up after election for the consideration of the House.

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith an editorial and a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the global war now raging has produced a number of outstanding military and naval leaders. The United States is playing the decisive role in this struggle by providing the greatest and most powerful Air Force, fighting Navy, and merchant marine in the world. These forces are backed by the largest and most powerful land Army in all our history and unparalleled production of war matériel. In the galaxy of military stars produced by all nations in this conflict, none compare with our own brilliant Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall. He has shown an unexampled grasp of the problems involved in worldwide strategy. As the leading military representative of the greatest Nation on earth, he has conceived, planned, and molded our military strategy which is proving so highly successful everywhere. His knowledge of our democratic institutions and the psychology of the American people is so thorough and comprehensive, he has been able to obtain the support of public opinion in this country for all phases of the war effort to a degree unexcelled in our history. Modest in demeanor, magnetic in personality, brilliant in the fields of tactics and strategy, consecrated to the cause of freedom and our way of life, the luster of his name and fame will shine through the ages.

[From the Gadsden Times of September 11, 1944]

GEORGE MARSHALL, CHIEF OF STAFF

Eisenhower, Patton, and MacArthur, the field commanders, are getting the attention these days. But George Marshall, who selected these officers to do their jobs and who planned the strategy, sits modestly in Washington seeing that his plans do not go astray.

Ask a schoolboy about Patton, MacArthur, or Eisenhower and he can tell you right off a good bit about them. Ask about General Marshall and he is likely to hesitate. Maybe the name is vaguely familiar. He has seen his picture somewhere. But he doesn't know much about General Marshall, because Marshall's name is not associated with the flow of battle.

Those in Washington who know say that General Marshall is chiefly responsible for our grand strategy. Roosevelt and Churchill discuss grand strategy and have the final say-so. But they listen first to George Marshall. More than any other man he has directed the American war effort on the field of battle.

General Marshall, a graduate of the famous Virginia Military Institute, personally selected Eisenhower, Patton, Bradley, and Clark for their specific jobs. He helped train them. He forgot West Point priorities and the old army seniority game and selected capable men for promotion to the important field commands.

Marshall was quick to see the need for increased air power. He was quick to adopt new battle technique. He has from the first fought the war with all modern devices at his command and not forgetting the wisdom of the military ages.

We should know more about this modest Chief of Staff, for he is worth knowing better and is worthy of much more admiration than the public has heaped upon him.

[From the Washington Post of September 11, 1944]

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

To find in the hour of supreme need that we had a soldier of the greatness of Gen.

George Catlett Marshall was a piece of good fortune that America hardly deserved. We have never been a military Nation. In normal times we've regarded our military men with grudging suspicion.

Entering his sixth year as Chief of Staff, Marshall has in 5 short years worked a miracle. Confirmation of his genius in direction and planning is now coming from all over the world. When time has blown away the fog of the present, I believe this man will stand forth as among the greatest of great men.

Four years ago the odds were heavily against him. The Nation was torn by deep inner conflicts. Congress was surly and suspicious. England stood alone, and many Americans would have let her go down. The German plan called for a crossing from Dakar to the bulge of Brazil and then up, with the aid of native Fascists drawn by success, toward the Panama Canal.

That last was no fiction. Four years ago it was a menacing reality, as no one knew better than the Chief of Staff.

What his share has been in the task of pulling the Nation together, it's too early to say. With Congress, it's been of the first importance. By a combination of tact and forthrightness he has won the confidence of men of all parties.

Appearing before congressional committees, he is never spectacular, never loud or demanding. When he speaks, you feel certain beyond any doubt that he speaks out of knowledge and out of deep inner conviction.

He has an extraordinary faculty for saying exactly what he means to say. It may be because his own ego never gets in the way of his true objective. He speaks precisely, crisply, yet without any military rhodomontade. Disciplined always, his deep humanity rarely shows on the surface.

On the score of his contribution to the organization of America's fighting strength, there's no need to wait for history. World War No. 1 proved him a master of logistics, which is the military term for getting the men and the stuff there in the quickest possible time.

As assistant chief of operations to the United States First Army in the fall of 1918, he had a try-out for the job he was to be called on to do 25 years later. His orders then were to transfer 600,000 troops, with all their supplies, from St. Mihiel to the Meuse-Argonne sector entirely by night and in complete secrecy. This meant, among other items, 40,000 tons of ammunition, 34 evacuation hospitals, 3,980 guns.

"It seldom happens in war that plans can be so precisely carried out as was possible in this instance," General Pershing said in his memoirs of the man who for 5 years after the first war served as his aide de camp. "The details of the movements of troops connected with this concentration were worked out under the able direction of Col. George C. Marshall."

What he did then was small in comparison to the job this time. He took an army equipped with stove pipes, built it into a superb striking force, and deployed it around the world.

In the 28 days after D-day, a million men were moved across the Channel. The great majority of them had never been in combat before, and yet thanks to their thorough training and their native stamina, they were able to drive back the Wehrmacht in all its pride and glory. Supplying the American Armies as they raced across France is an achievement that will be analyzed in textbooks for many years to come.

And yet, in spite of the concentration on great masses of men and incredible stores of supplies, General Marshall has never lost sight of the individual man. From members of his staff you hear instance after instance of his consideration for the men serving under him. That consideration extends down to the lowliest private. This man at

the head of our Army is a human being as well as a general.

OKLAHOMA HIGHWAY COMMISSIONER

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I read in the Washington Times-Herald that the Civil Service Commission asked that a member of the Oklahoma State Highway Commission be fired. This man was appointed by the Governor of our State without regard to the Civil Service Commission. He was our State chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee at the time he was appointed. He held over for a short while, and this fact with his activities in connection with a victory dinner, they say, violates the Hatch Act. It occurs to me with all the legitimate complaints made by Members of Congress against violators of the Hatch Act against persons employed by the Federal Government should be given prior consideration, but not so; apparently they are hunting for big fish.

I have called attention to the fact of numerous primary election violations and I am lucky if I can get one of their investigators to make a verbal report in a year and a half, to say nothing of being able to find any evidence to sustain the complaint. Everyone in the District knows about it but the Civil Service Commission.

The first thing we know they will attempt to stop school boards from taking any part in elections. It occurs to me as one that has made two races for Congress that nothing is ever done when a Federal employee goes out and beats the bushes for their candidate. The next thing we know the Civil Service Commission will ask for a law, that all employees of the various States come under their jurisdiction. It is high time that if the Civil Service Commission can interfere with a State official that we change the laws. If a State desires a Hatch Act let the State pass the law. I have been told by two civil-service investigators that only \$50,000 per annum was available to make investigations and that they would do the best they can under the circumstances, but under the circumstances they have done exactly nothing, yet they can make the front page of every daily newspaper in the country of their findings in recommending the firing of a member of the State highway commission of my State.

Hon. France Paris is not entitled to be made the subject of such outbursts as printed on the front page of the Washington Herald. In the first place he did not have to qualify under any civil-service examination to be appointed, his salary is paid by State funds, and on the other hand there are many violators in Oklahoma, yes in Oklahoma if you please, that are under civil service and I know of nothing being done about it

other than the excuse that funds are not available to make an investigation.

When any Member of Congress introduces a law without regard to the civil-service laws they will receive a letter asking them to be sure and strike the provision.

The Civil Service Commission on their own motion should reconsider their action with respect to Mr. Paris and reverse their holdings or they should make a sincere effort to see that all violators are brought to justice. I have actually called to the attention of appointing heads the violation of Federal employees and nothing has been done about it, and if that is the way the Civil Service Commission is going to hold they should be told about, not just this time but often. Many of the official heads have the authority to pass upon the justification of applicants and if an applicant for a job does not suit their fancy it has been my experience that they will find a way to scuttle him. In one case 2 years ago a guard at the Red River Dam opened up the headquarters of my opponent and managed his campaign and as soon as the campaign was over he was put back on his job. I wrote the employing head and he said that he had gotten a release from his job and in view of the fact that he was a good guard he reemployed him, and that is not a violation of the Hatch Act. It may be necessary for me to bring to the well of the House all cases in which I am interested, and if such procedure becomes necessary, I assure you, I shall pursue such a course.

The Civil Service Commission should see to it that each State receives its quota of employees with the respect of the population of any State to the population of the whole United States, and I mean in equal rating along with the proper percentage. We have visited many Federal agencies here in the Capital City and in the State of Oklahoma, and if we have our quota I am a bad calculator, for in many if not most cases the Federal employees in Oklahoma are from some of the other States or the District of Columbia.

The article in the Washington Times-Herald is as follows:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ASKS OKLAHOMA HIGHWAY CHIEF BE FIRED

The Civil Service Commission ruled yesterday that France Paris, Oklahoma State highway commissioner, should be removed from office because his service as State Democratic chairman and his activities in connection with a victory dinner to raise campaign funds violated the Hatch Act.

Commissioners Arthur S. Flemming and Lucille F. McMillin voted for Paris' removal following a Commission hearing, with Commission President Harry B. Mitchell dissenting. Mitchell held that, although a violation of the act had been established, it was not of a character to warrant or require removal from office.

"If it were required to show evil intent or premeditated purpose to violate or defy the law (to justify removal from office) we should not find that Mr. Paris' removal was justified," the majority report said.

"The respondent, however patriotic his motives might have been, simply failed to realize that the Hatch Act required him to make a choice between serving the public as a whole in official employment and serving a party in partisan employment."

"It is not for the Commission to say that this particular type of offense is inconsequential. If a person can serve as State chairman (of a political party) with impunity, how could this Commission consistently impose a penalty for service anywhere down the line?"

GIVE THE WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS A BREAK

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing H. R. 5349, a bill to permit weekly newspapers to suspend publication for not more than two issues in any one calendar year without the loss of second-class mail privileges.

The daily newspapers can, in general, afford to give their employees vacations, and they all have managers, as well, who can oversee affairs when the publisher wants time off. The small weeklies—the backbone of the newspaper industry—are usually run by a man or woman who has to be publisher, editor, printer, advertising man, and reporter, all in one. These people, I believe, are entitled to the privilege of a vacation without having to reapply for a second-class reentry which not only takes time but costs \$10 as well.

I have been informed that the Montana State Press Association when it met in Missoula on August 19 and 20, 1944, went on record in favor of State legislation which would change the frequency of issues so that newspapers could continue to qualify as mediums for the publication of legal advertising.

The passing of the bill by Congress will, when the States affected change their laws covering legal notices, be of inestimable value to the weekly publishers and give them the chance to take much needed vacations which they are all barred from having now. It will give the little fellows in the newspaper field a break; it will confer no special favor; it will not cost the Government anything; and it will recognize a needed adjustment in a field that needs this assistance and needs it now. I sincerely hope that this measure will receive the enthusiastic support of the entire membership of the House.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the regular order of business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, the district which I represent is connected

up with the economic, cultural, and social life of the great Territory of Alaska. We have many legislative and other problems in common.

Since I have been a Member of this House it has been my great pleasure to work with the man who has represented the great Territory of Alaska. Inasmuch as many of us will be here only a few days longer, and inasmuch as that gentleman is going to grace the bench in his home Territory of Alaska, I would be somewhat derelict in my duty to my own constituency, to my feeling toward him, and to the people of Alaska, if I did not place in the RECORD at this time some semblance of spoken word regarding the fine work he has done in the House during his long service here. I refer to the Delegate of Alaska, Hon. ANTHONY J. DIMOND. I shall tell him as I tell the people of Alaska that his leaving here will not only be our loss but the loss of the inhabitants of that great Territory. We all wish him well.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

WAR LEADERSHIP

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] is most reassuring to me and I am sure it will be to many of the people of the country in the light of the money that has been spent and the great number of words that have been printed trying to convince the people of the country that all the success of this war was due to the gentleman in the White House.

We now learn that it is General Marshall who has been doing this work. I say I am glad to know that when the President goes out of office, if the war still continues, we shall have a capable and successful leader to direct the war program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Westbrook Pegler from the Times-Herald of this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

PEARL HARBOR RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the charge has been made on the floor of this House and has been widely quoted all over the Nation to the effect that several days before the attack upon Pearl Harbor the Australian Government had warned the United States of such an impending attack; that it had notified Washington that a Japanese task force was preceding eastward toward Hawaii. All over America people are asking whether or not such a statement as this can possibly be true. If it is not true, they will demand that such loose talk be immediately stopped, even if it is made in the Halls of Congress.

An Associated Press dispatch from Australia dated September 12 quotes Prime Minister John Curtin as flatly denying this rumor. I quote from the dispatch:

This is pure invention. Our cables had no data regarding the Japanese Fleet.

The Prime Minister's statement should end this rumor once and for all; it is evident that it is only one more rather clumsy attempt to play a dangerous brand of partisan politics.

It seems to me the Members of this House should have adequate data before they make statements of this kind which they know will be widely quoted all over America.

If any Member of this House has any proof, I ask him to come forward and give it now; if not, I would respectfully suggest that such un-American types of political campaigning be suspended at least for the duration.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from California. For over a year, yes, for over 2 years, the American people have been demanding all the facts pertaining to Pearl Harbor, but the administration continues to keep the lid on.

Admiral Kimmel and General Short have asked for an opportunity to be heard and to tell the American people the facts. Only a few days ago General Short announced that when the facts are known to the American people the blame for our unpreparedness at Pearl Harbor must be laid elsewhere. Certainly that would not be in Tokyo; but rather, in Washington.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DEMobilIZATION AND RECONVERSION

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Monday next for me to make two motions to instruct the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 2051) entitled "An act to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes."

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, we are in full accord on this side with the request of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what this request really amounts to is that it shortens the process of accomplishing that which this resolution accomplishes: It gives two motions to recommit and it will give sufficient time to debate the two matters in disagreement. All this does is just shorten the process which will have to be gone through with unless this unanimous-consent request is granted?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand what the gentleman is trying to do, although I have an idea what he is trying to do. Inasmuch as we are going to adjourn here shortly and will not know what he proposes to do, will he explain it?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of the gentleman from North Carolina, if this request is granted, to ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD at this point the two motions he expects to make on Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the two motions which it is my purpose to offer on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The motions referred to follow:

Mr. DOUGHTON moves to instruct the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 2051) entitled "An Act to Amend the Social Security Act, as Amended, to Provide a National Program for War Mobilization and Reconversion, and

for Other Purposes," to insist on their disagreement to section 403 of said Senate bill relating to unemployment compensation for Federal employees.

Mr. DOUGHTON moves to instruct the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 2051) entitled "An Act to Amend the Social Security Act as Amended, to Provide a National Program for War Mobilization and Reconversion, and for Other Purposes," to insist on their disagreement to section 303 of said Senate bill relating to the transportation of civilian workers.

RUMORS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have a very strong feeling of personal friendship for my friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]. I do not like to see him continuously making statements that are not consistent with the facts. For example, not so long ago, being bereft of any issue, he created a fight with the President's little dog Fala. This was found to be incorrect. Then he tried to offset that, when the truth was made known, by saying that Drew Pearson had stated it cost \$20,000,000 for the President to take his trip and hold conferences in Hawaii. What Pearson said was the Republicans would charge that.

Now he makes the statement about the administration putting "the lid on" and like the other two statements it is entirely without foundation and is made out of whole cloth.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield inasmuch as he made a statement about me?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman has made a statement here that I feel should be answered. The gentleman has access to information denied the minority.

May I suggest to the distinguished gentleman that he call up the proper official and find out if it is true that instead of a destroyer having been used a plane was used? Will the gentleman also inquire from his friend, Admiral Leahy, if the cruiser that carried the President to Hawaii was not accompanied by a carrier and three destroyers?

Mr. McCORMACK. In response to the gentleman's question, may I say he is guilty of the same offense of rumor mongering. The gentleman is also guilty of befogging the facts.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the most important thing that the gentleman from Minnesota said was that if all the facts were brought out about this matter the blame

would rest elsewhere than with the commanders at Hawaii and that in his opinion it would not be on Tokyo but rather upon Washington.

That remark brings up something a great deal deeper than some of these other things that have been talked about. All I want to say is that as far as I am personally concerned, I believe the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor was the fault of Japan, not the United States; and, furthermore, the only way, if you will read the history of the last few years, that the attack on Pearl Harbor or something altogether like it could have been avoided would have been for the United States to tell the Japanese to go ahead and do just exactly as they pleased in China and all over the Pacific Basin.

ALASKAN WATER POWER—HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in paying tribute to our distinguished colleague from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND].

No one regrets seeing him leave this House more than I do, for he has been a faithful and diligent servant of the people of that great Territory.

As a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors he went along with me in my efforts to get a survey of the potential water power in Alaska, with a view to its development and distribution; which would be the greatest improvement the Territory has ever known. There is a wealth of undeveloped water power in Alaska, sufficient to make it a rich and a prosperous land.

On several occasions I have addressed this House on water-power developments in Japan and Russia, and also in the European, Asiatic, and African countries as well as South America. In each of these presentations I have stressed the high importance of knowing world trends, modern developments, and progress. With the advance of the present war, and the resulting discussions on peace and post-war monetary arrangements, the trends that I have previously mentioned, are becoming more pronounced.

If we are to hold our own as a nation we must give more attention to our resource balance sheet in the future than we have in the past.

Today I wish to carry these studies further by taking another look at our resource inventory, and to then point out how some of our future national deficiencies can be corrected by giving more attention to the opportunities that are possible in Alaska.

WAR AND RESOURCE DEPLETION

For years it was the popular belief that this country had an unlimited supply of natural resources. Events since Pearl Harbor, and the restrictions under which we have since lived, have exploded that theory. All who have investigated

scientifically our resource levels under the demands of this global war, have urged serious consideration of ways and means to protect our future position.

I have on a number of occasions called this matter to the attention of this House. How many Members can answer these questions: How long a period of time will our vital resources sources be kept above the danger point? Have we assurances that the material shortages of the past 2 years are not indications of future permanent shortages? To throw some light on this important subject let us examine the facts on the supply situation of a few most vital materials.

VITAL MATERIALS

Let us first consider our petroleum reserves. Up to a short time ago we were supplying about 60 percent of the Allied oil requirements. A year ago the Secretary of the Interior, when appearing before the Senate Appropriations Committee, stressed the seriousness of the oil situation. It has been clearly established that our oil supply is not inexhaustible. We have actually encountered a reversal in the graph relating new discoveries to consumption demands. Since Pearl Harbor, new developments have seriously lagged behind current requirements, and the extent of our new fields have materially decreased. The best evidence we have today is that 10 to 15 years consumption will definitely see this Nation in the midst of an oil depletion cycle. It is true that new fields are being developed in Mississippi and other areas, but they may not prove sufficient.

Our high-grade iron-ore deposits are rapidly being dug out. The great Mesabi range, which has in years past supplied over 80 percent of our iron requirements will be, from present indications, depleted in 10 or 15 years. Our former numerous copper mines have been exhausted, and all that remains in continental United States are the mines of western Montana and Arizona. The same facts can be shown to apply to other major materials such as lead, zinc, and bauxite.

These materials will have to be replaced to a large extent by aluminum taken from aluminum-bearing clays of which we have an unlimited supply. But it will take large amounts of electricity to process it.

A year ago the Bureau of Mines gave Members of the Senate complete listings on 20 other important metals where this Nation's supply is inadequate to meet its peacetime needs. These 20 different metals are highly essential in the manufacture of high-strength, high-quality alloys, which are needed for modern machines, like automobiles, ships, trucks, tanks, and airplanes. All the metals that I have mentioned are highly important both in peace and in war.

What has happened in Europe since D-day simply confirms a principle that has been established since the beginning of time. This principle is that any nation which loses its resource base becomes a decadent nation, and later the prey of other nations. China is an outstanding example of a solid nation losing its resource base, both agriculturally

from soil erosion, and in minerals through depletion and lack of exploration.

MODERN PROCESSES

Mr. Speaker, we became in the past decade a great Nation by building our industries around what has since been known as conventional processes. However, progress has altered processes. For 40 years the tendency has been to swing away from the older conventional processes where high-strength, high-quality products are needed. Modern machines, like the airship, the naval carrier, the heavy fighting ships, the truck, and the automobile, as well as modern chemicals, are dependent on electric processes to secure the requisite strength and quality demanded by progress.

The material quality now needed must come from the electric cell or the electric furnace. I have stated on several occasions before this House that the automobile industry at Detroit would not have been possible if the electric alloys manufactured at Niagara with low-cost hydro power had not been available. Modern commerce has required, and will in the future require, more and more electric metals. This means a coupling of two resources—namely, water power and metallic ores and agricultural products. Water power is the only resource we have that cannot be depleted. It has well been stated that it is equivalent to a mine that cannot be dug out or an oil well that never runs dry.

Fortunately, for the country, we had developed sizable blocks of low-cost hydro at T. V. A., Boulder Dam, and on the Columbia. I do not know where we would have been in this war without them, as nearly 70 percent of the modern metals going into our air program came from these Federal hydro projects. To clarify our thinking along these lines we should look upon the modern metals as frozen kilowatts and the modern chemicals as liquid or gaseous kilowatts.

Price of any essential product determines its place in industry and commerce. Therefore, the price of power is a large factor in the effective coupling of the resources I have mentioned. Take, for example, the highly essential light metals like aluminum and magnesium. Each difference of a tenth of a cent per kilowatt-hour of power cost changes the pound price of the metal by 1 cent. Therefore, an abundance of cheap electricity is absolutely necessary.

A realization of these control factors by Germany resulted in the seizure of Norway, a country rich in hydro power. I have previously developed for the benefit of my colleagues a picture of the hydro-power resources of Norway. To restate for the purposes of this discussion, I wish to again call attention to the fact that Norway leads all the countries in the world both in developed and potential hydro power per thousand population. Over one-tenth of the national wealth of Norway is represented by hydroelectric installations, and over 75 percent of its people, up until the German occupation, had received all the benefits low-cost electricity could bestow.

A PROTECTED PEACE

By resolution and by action this Nation is committed to a speedy victory and such international cooperation as will preserve peace. The latter is a generalized statement, which lacks practicability unless we consider both from a national and international standpoint the effective equalization of resource bases. Until we do, we will not accomplish our objective of a protected peace. Present discussions seem to have neglected this practical fundamental.

Nationally at this time we must take action only on those essentials which will preserve our resource base. If we do not we will find that with depletion this Nation will encounter a lowering of living standards and a drop in earning power. If we do not protect our resource base we will find that our standards will drop to the level of the countries from which we import to overcome deficiencies. Then will follow an upset in our trade and industrial system and we will reach the point where we cannot hold our world position. What can be done about this long-range gloomy outlook?

We can protect our resource base by a resurvey of all of its elements, and by using the opportunities the Creator has given us. The main purpose of these remarks today is to point out resource opportunities in Alaska.

ALASKA CLIMATE

There has been so much misinformation existing as to the climate of Alaska, that the facts need to be stated in order to correctly appraise the situation under discussion. Because of the eastward course in the Pacific of the Japanese current, the climatic effect is similar to that existing in the States of Washington and Oregon, and in northwestern Europe, resulting from the course of the Gulf Stream. This results in a mild temperature, in the coastal regions, with a mean annual temperature of 55° to 60°. Temperature extremes do exist, however, in the inland plateau areas; for example, the mean temperature range at Fort Yukon, near the boundary between Alaska and Canada is 64° in the summer to minus 31° in the winter.

The rainfall in the coastal regions is heavy and ranges between 80 and 110 inches per mean year which is about the same as exists in the heavy potential hydropower areas of Washington and Oregon, west of the Cascades.

The Alaskan point of highest latitude is Point Barrow on the Arctic Ocean. This is exactly the same latitude as the most northerly point of Norway. The southern extremity of Alaska is about 54 degrees latitude, which is three and a half degrees of latitude, or about 300 statute miles, south of the Norwegian most southerly point.

The Alaskan coast line has topography similar to that of Oregon and Washington, and also the west coast of Norway. The coast-line topography is precipitous and is indented with numerous deep fjords.

From this it can be seen that generally the Alaskan areas west of the extended American Cascade Range, have water-fall and water volumes comparable with

the great potential power areas of Norway and the best power sections in this country, namely, Oregon and Washington.

RUSSIAN DEVELOPMENTS

On this floor on June 8, 1943, I traced at length the great Russian resource advances since the first Gelro plan of 1920. What Russia is doing so effectively in the war today is the result of coupling together its mineral and chemical resources with power.

The Russian foresight of the past 25 years in minerals, chemicals, and power has brought that country to a top position amongst nations. Their foresight is progressively continuing, and, as an example of national wisdom, I wish to cite a few facts that have developed since the German invasion of that country, when the large Dnieperstroy and other power plants were destroyed. I cite these facts not in any sense of criticism but to bring out modern trends, and to show the power progress of forward-looking nations.

MINERAL RESOURCES

In 1867 we purchased Alaska with \$7,200,000 in gold. Since that date we have taken out of the Territory about 90 times the amount of gold represented by this purchase price.

With so much of the Alaskan area unexplored and not surveyed, it would be wild speculation to attempt to state Alaskan reserve volumes. But certain mineral facts are sufficiently established to clearly indicate possibilities, and with such reservation I wish to point out a few of these possibilities in connection with electric processes.

The remaining placer gold reserves in Alaska are probably equal to what has been taken out since acquisition, and the gold lode reserves may exceed the placer reserves. Placer mining is now conducted in Alaska with large power dredges and 24 large operating organizations.

The strategic minerals like copper, tin, antimony, platinum, chromium, tungsten, and molybdenum have been located in Alaska. These are all processed by modern electric methods. Only tin and antimony have been mined commercially. Copper production in Alaska ceased in 1938 because of the world competitive price situation, but by electric processes copper can still be produced. From the small amount of information available it can be safely stated that possibilities for upbuilding our mineral resource base in Alaska through use of electric processing is very substantial.

POWER RESOURCES

Additional water resource surveys are needed to fully cover Alaskan power possibilities both in the usable streams and in the fjords along the coast. These two classes of hydro power will be discussed separately as they involve different fundamentals.

Water resource investigations in Alaska have been meager. From 1906 to 1921 the United States Geological Survey carried out intermittent investigations until available funds were exhausted. These earlier water resource

surveys resulted from the demands of the mining industry, and were, therefore, scattered. In the national forest area stream measurement programs have been carried on by the Forest Service in cooperation with the Federal Power Commission.

The favorable combination of high rainfall, heavy run-off, natural storage sites, high falls, and the nearness of such sites to navigable water makes the southeastern and the south central portions of Alaska an unusually attractive location for hydro projects. Reconnaissance surveys have been made on power sites with possibilities exceeding 800,000 horsepower which is equal to 3,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. These known sites need to be developed to promote industry to use the mineral, timber, fish, fur, and other resources of Alaska. In the other parts of Alaska no surveys or measurements have been made. Obviously additional field work is necessary.

From the information that is available it can be conservatively stated that the usable Alaskan streams have potential power possibilities of about 1,500,000 horsepower of firm power good for 7,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually and 2,500,000 of good quality secondary power or 9,000,000,000 annual kilowatt-hours, capable of being used industrially, or a total of around 4,000,000 horsepower or 16,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours—or about as much as is now used in Pennsylvania. The best potential water-power States in this country are Washington, Oregon, California, New York, and Idaho. The potential stream power in Alaska is nearly equal to that of New York and Idaho on a potential installed basis, and is about two-thirds that of Oregon and one-half of the amount that exists in the State of Washington.

As I have previously pointed out, we will have shipped by next July to Russia power equipment totaling nearly one-half of all stream potential power in Alaska, and with power equipment now under negotiation the Russian total of United States procurement should be nearly double this type of Alaskan possibilities. For comparison, it should be stated that the actual developed hydro-horsepower in Norway is 3,500,000, or 16,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours; in Italy, 6,300,000, or 23,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours; and in Switzerland 3,300,000, or 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. These nations have become great industrially by utilizing water power averaging about equal to the Alaskan potentialities. The very profitable Norwegian hydro installations each range in size from 100,000 to 300,000 horsepower, capable of producing 480,000,000 to 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. The Norwegian installations have another marked commercial advantage besides low cost, and that is they are located adjacent to tidewater and low transportation costs. The Alaskan possibilities also have a decided commercial advantage, and Alaskan resources and conditions are similar to those of Norway.

The tidal range along the middle coast of Alaska is about 48 feet. Such outstanding protected fjords like Cooks

Inlet and Susitna Lake have large power possibilities. The amount of this capacity cannot be definitely stated until surveys have been made, but conservative estimates lead to the conclusion that the available Alaskan tidal power will equal about one-half of the stream potential power capability I have given, which in kilowatt-hours represents between seven and eight billion kilowatt-hours a year.

There is very little feasible potential power located along the route of the Alaskan Highway from Fort Nelson, British Columbia to Fairbanks, Alaska, or on the inland streams because of ice.

The installed hydro plants in Alaska now only total the small amount of 45,000 horsepower, or about one-fiftieth of what we will have supplied to the Russians by the end of this fiscal year. This represents capability of about 200,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year. What I have given indicates that we are neglecting one very essential part of the foundation of our resource base.

A LAND OF OPPORTUNITIES

The Territory of Alaska is our last frontier. It is one that must not be neglected. We are going to have to maintain air bases in Alaska for all time to come and to correct the deficiencies resulting from years of neglect. We owe this not only to our returning soldiers but to all our people. For our own national protection we need to correct the erosion of our own resource base through feasible Alaskan developments. Our national resource deficiencies will first come in those fields involving different forms of energy. Therefore, we cannot afford to neglect the only non-depleting resource we have, namely, water power. We have helped other nations reestablish their bases and it is well to remember that we should do likewise at home.

In this way we can make a new and a brighter land of Alaska and provide there a permanent home for a growing and a self-sustaining population.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to supplement the remarks made by my colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and also the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] in saying a few words panegyricizing the career and activities of the distinguished Delegate from Alaska, the Honorable TONY DIMOND. As one who represents a district in effect almost

adjacent to the vast Territory to the northward, I cherish more than a mere friendship for TONY DIMOND. The loss of Congress is a gain of the Judiciary. TONY DIMOND has represented Alaska in a wholly impartial manner. His popularity in the House of Representatives is almost unparalleled. The projects and Federal aid for which he has crusaded in connection with the Territory of Alaska have been supported without regard to party. To a large extent the remarkable contributions he has rendered to the Territory of Alaska are due to the infectious personality and the persuasive logic of the Honorable TONY DIMOND.

May I say in behalf of the House that we will all miss you immeasurably. We know that when you go back there your life will be somewhat easier, insofar as it is removed from the incessant clamors and the nerve strains of the 2-year elections, which are the ineluctable lot of every Member of the House. We know that your judicial career will be outstanding and notable. Our felicitations and our warm sympathy go with you. We wish you happiness, longevity, and prosperity in your new career.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. I, too, want to say a word concerning the distinguished Delegate from Alaska, Hon. ANTHONY DIMOND. The relationship between California and Alaska has been most intimate all through the years. As a matter of fact, you will be interested to know that at one time a section of California was Russian territory. Government of Russian interests in California was located at Sitka, Alaska.

Russian River, just north of San Francisco Bay, gets its name from a Russian settlement at its mouth.

In my city scores and scores of ships were outfitted for the Alaska salmon industry. Great salmon-canning companies were started in San Francisco. The same is true of trading companies handling furs and other products.

Many San Franciscans devoted their lives and their fortunes in developing Alaska.

Our association with the Territory has been close indeed. We hope it grows still closer in the years ahead.

Personally I feel a deep sense of loss in realizing that genial TONY DIMOND is leaving the House of Representatives. We all shall miss him. I wish him God-speed and good luck in his new responsibilities.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I know we all feel the great loss this Congress will sustain by the resignation of our good colleague the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND]. It is a privilege and a pleasure

for me to say a few words about this fine, outstanding gentleman. As a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of the Interior I have seen the Delegate from Alaska come before our committee and make requests pertaining to his Territory. These requests have always been fair, and the demands he has made upon the pocket-book of the American people have always been in line with good common sense. For that reason, he generally has gotten what he wanted.

It is a pleasure and a privilege for me to say these few words for our good friend the gentleman from Alaska, TONY DIMOND. We wish him well and Godspeed in the new endeavors he is about to enter.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, TONY DIMOND has served on my committee as long as he has been here. I do not know of any man who has been more valuable. I might say that he is invaluable. I regret very much to see him go. He knows the fisheries, he knows the merchant marine, he knows all the subjects that come before the committee. It will be very, very hard to find a man to take his place. I shall miss him very much. I shall miss him personally, but, more than that, I shall miss his counsel, his advice, his wisdom, and his experience. The whole committee wishes him Godspeed and regrets exceedingly that he is going to continue no longer with us.

We could depend upon him. Every representation he ever made on any matter presented the truth of the situation, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Tony, God bless you wherever you go and may Heaven's richest blessings be yours through the years that are to come, and may they be many.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly would feel derelict in my duty if I did not add a word to what has been said with reference to our good friend, TONY DIMOND, in connection with his leaving this august body. I have had the pleasure of serving with him on the Committee on the Territories for a number of years. There has been no man with whom I have come in contact here in the House for whom I have a higher regard than he. TONY DIMOND has brought to his work a very fine understanding of the problems of his own district. He has been most diligent and effective in his work here in this body. He has been broad-minded in his consideration not only of the problems with which he has had to do personally affecting Alaska but all the problems that have come before us during that time.

Last summer I had the privilege of visiting Alaska and meeting TONY DIMOND while there. He showed me every courtesy.

May I say, with reference to that great Territory, that we have in Alaska a remarkable asset. I feel such many of you do not appreciate the strategic importance of the Territory of Alaska to this great country, particularly in the years that are ahead of us, with the development of the great airway leading from the continental United States to Siberia and Asia over the top of the world through Alaska. The work we have done there in furtherance of the war effort will be one of the outstanding contributions in this great conflict which is now soon, we hope, to be brought to a close. TONY DIMOND has done remarkable and outstanding work in his contribution to that great endeavor. I know he will render the same high service on the Federal bench. I wish him Godspeed.

UNEMPLOYMENT-COMPENSATION BENEFITS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, when the motion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means comes before the House on Monday, the House will have an opportunity to vote upon the amendment I tried to present to the House when the bill was under consideration here, to include Federal employees within the scope of unemployment-compensation benefits. At the time the discussion was had upon that subject by the gentleman who is now addressing the House, some very wild and extravagant statements were made as to the possible cost of the inclusion of Federal employees within this program. I did not have an opportunity thereafter to answer those wild and extravagant statements that were made in the RECORD. I shall attempt to briefly do so now.

It must be understood that the proposal to include Federal employees under unemployment compensation does not contemplate the establishment of a Federal system. The amendment which I offered, and which was ruled out on a point of order, simply provides that all Federal employees shall be entitled to receive unemployment compensation in accordance with the laws of the State in which the service was rendered. This means, therefore, that the States, through their unemployment compensation agencies, would retain full authority to administer the law. Payments of unemployment compensation would only be made in accordance with the law of the State in which the Federal employee rendered his service. The States would be merely acting as the agents of the Federal Government in administering the payment of unemployment compensation to Federal employees. Thus, every employee would be equitably and reasonably treated.

A shipyard worker released from employment in Alabama would receive unemployment compensation in accordance with the unemployment compensation laws of the State of Alabama. The rate of payment, the duration of payment, and any disabilities inflicted by Alabama law would control, regardless of the place of residence of the employee.

It must be borne in mind that all unemployment compensation in the States is paid out of funds derived from a tax on pay rolls paid by the employer. I believe only one State provides for any part of the tax to be paid by the employee. Therefore, it must be clear that had Federal employees been included within the program when the law was first enacted the contribution to the trust fund would have been made by the Federal Government the same as private employers.

What we seek to do now is to ask employer Uncle Sam to treat his employees in exactly the same manner as employees of private industry are treated.

It must be borne in mind, also, that all State laws require employees to subject themselves to employment opportunities and to report at stated periods to the U. S. E. S. office. In the event a person receives unemployment compensation and is thereafter exposed to a suitable employment opportunity, unemployment compensation will cease under State laws when the employee refuses to accept such employment.

It must also be borne in mind that the amount of compensation and the duration of payment varies throughout the various States and Territories. The average for the Nation is less than \$20 per week for a period of not to exceed 20 weeks in any year. Thus, the maximum amount that could be obtained under the average figures just quoted would be \$400 per employee. Assuming that 3,000,000 Federal employees were to all be discharged and the processes of government completely halted, the maximum amount that would be required to pay unemployment compensation under such circumstances could not possibly exceed \$1,200,000,000. If any person can conceive of such a monstrous situation developing in our economy, then God help America. No one can prophesy with certainty how many Government employees will be discharged nor what period of time will be necessary to accomplish the reduction in Government personnel. If 1,000,000 were discharged in the next year and all of them were unable to secure employment, the most that the Government would have to pay for its contributions to the States would be \$400,000,000. If we are to have a wave of post-war prosperity with full employment, then the inclusion of Federal workers in the program becomes a moot question. If we are to have continuous wholesale unemployment, then we must prepare now to take care of the situation.

The unemployment-compensation program in my judgment offers a much better groundwork of stability and economy than would be found in hurried attempts to provide relief projects under another W. P. A. We must bear in mind that this Government will continue to function at the conclusion of hostilities, and

many of the agencies of the Government that have been set up will continue for a considerable period in our post-war era. The regular establishments of government will continue and the regular civil service employees will remain on the pay roll.

Is it not clear therefore that the bogey thrown into this discussion as to cost is designed merely to frighten and confuse Members of Congress? I fully believe that the United States Government, the greatest employer in the Nation, owes it to the States who have adopted unemployment compensation for private employees and employers, to set an example and to give its employees the benefits which it has bestowed upon the employees of private employers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, and further to extend my remarks and include a brief article from the American Bar Association Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] may extend his own remarks and include some excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE NATURAL IRRESPONSIBILITY OF INEXPERIENCED YOUTH VERSUS THE ALLEGED WEARINESS OF TIRED OLD AGE

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the opposition brought forth, early in this campaign, what it apparently regarded then, and I suppose still does, as the paramount issue of the campaign, I did not take it very seriously. I scarcely thought it consequential. But I am delighted to say to my good friends on the other side of the aisle that they have finally and entirely converted me and caused me to thoroughly agree with their position that this really is the prime and paramount issue in this campaign, an issue which deserves the careful consideration of every American voter—hence my discussion of it. I refer, of course, to the issue of the natural irresponsibility of inexperienced youth, versus the alleged weariness of tired old age. Now, as I say, only recent developments have succeeded in converting me to agreement with that position. These

developments have, in fact occurred since Governor Dewey commenced his present campaign tour. The emphasis that has been placed on that issue by one party to the campaign, coupled with the remarks of their candidate, has caused me to wonder if it is really a fact that they honestly do intend, in the event of the far-fetched possibility of their success, to propose a constitutional amendment and urge its adoption by the States to stipulate a maximum age of 45 years for President, 40 years for membership in the other body, and 35 years for membership in this body. I can but wonder, too, if it is really a fact that they will pass a law, regulation, or order, causing it to be impossible for the Chief of Staff of our Army and the Commander in Chief of our Navy to be over 45 years old; one preventing a man over 40 years old serving as a major general, one over 35 being a brigadier general, and stipulating that no colonel be more than 30, and no lieutenant colonel or major more than 25.

I wonder, too, if, should they by any chance be successful, they would logically continue this procedure by urging on those Governors of States whose misfortune it may be at the time to belong to the Republican Party, the passage of legislation by the State stipulating a maximum age of 30 years for Governor and 25 years for other State officers.

Thinking along that line caused my mind to revert to an editorial from the Birmingham Age-Herald of about 2 weeks ago, which I read:

REPUBLICAN PROPAGANDA

Insidious Republican propaganda has invaded Democratic homes in Birmingham, and there is great consequent distress in certain of them. Apparently, the Republican campaign management has set about organization of an Infants-for-Dewey League of Alabama. It is a distressing manifestation of the Southern "revolt" of the Democratic Party and stems undoubtedly from the Texas oil millionaires' electoral vote withholding manipulation, contaminated undoubtedly by similar abortive efforts in South Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

Evidence of plutocratic capital financing this insidious propaganda movement has alarmed the Democratic Party authorities, and a congressional investigation will be requested in the next few days. * * * Whether it is simply an exploitation of the Dewey-Dulles, or Dulles-Dewey campaign for greater authority for small nations in the international security organization is not yet known.

At any rate, here are the facts as developed by the Democratic gestapo agents, alarmed by this totalitarian manifestation of Republican aims:

A few days ago a young father, a Democrat, a Federal office-holder, a bureaucrat, perhaps, reported to Democratic headquarters that his 18-month-old daughter was going about the house, muttering sotto voce, "Dooey, Dooey, Dooey, Dooey." This was bad enough, but worse was yet to come. Not satisfied with having apparently captured the year-and-a-half old sweepstakes, the Dewey-Dulles outfit has gone further, and now an editor, a lifelong Democrat, an ardent Roosevelt supporter, alleges that his 5-month-old grandson, who bears his name, has been heard to offer a modified version of the same mumbling treason, namely, "Dooey, Dooey." So far neither has been heard trafficking with the sacred name of Dulles.

The matter has been laid before the Alabama delegation in the House, as well as before both Senators BANKHEAD and HILL.

Is ne passeront pas, exclaim these Democratic parents and grandparents, as they expose this nefarious attempt to foist Dulles-Dewey on an unsuspecting Alabama Democratic world. Down with this effort to seduce the infants of Alabama to the Republican billfold!

Ridiculous, do you think? So did I when I first read it. In fact, as I read that editorial to Mrs. Jarman, as we drove from Tuscaloosa to Birmingham, her comment, with which I agreed, was, "That editor had a lot to do to write that." I thought so, but as I read it again on the plane I was impressed that it might not be so farfetched after all and it occurred to me not to throw that paper away, but to clip the editorial and place it in my portfolio where it peacefully slept unthought of again until Governor Dewey commenced this campaign tour. Then it was positively called to my attention and I became convinced that this issue of the natural irresponsibility of inexperienced youth versus the alleged weariness of old age was really the main one in this campaign. Time of course does not permit me to dwell on the numerous remarks of the Governor which so convinced me. I shall explore only one of them.

In New York in his press conference just before the tour commenced, as I recall, he commented on the alleged intention to keep the soldiers in the Army because it was cheaper to do that than to maintain them outside; and as I recall he used the indefinite expression "they say." Proceeding to Philadelphia and using the speech doubtless prepared by his ghost writers—since this reference appeared in its published text—he repeated that charge and said the administration was going to do thus and so. That accusation naturally brought forth loud applause just as any criticism of this administration to that audience would have elicited great applause. Undoubtedly the irresponsibility of his youth caused him to be misled by that applause into believing he had hit the bull's-eye, so down at Louisville the next night in a speech in which the prepared ghost writers' text, as published in the press, contained no reference to this. He bounded forth in the exuberance of his naturally irresponsible youth to greater heights, repeating this charge, and this time accusing the New Deal of the determination to unnecessarily retain soldiers in the Army after the war. Within just a few days prior to that first statement the acting chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate and the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House had given press interviews in which they referred to the plans for demobilization which they said were proceeding apace, and stated that the War Department would give out details the following day at noon, which occurred. Every other comment on this phase I have read or heard has been favorable. Not only that, but as early as June 12 Justice Byrnes had made this statement:

Our fighting men are entitled to first consideration in any plan of demobilization.

Their orderly release at the earliest possible moment consistent with the effective prosecution of the war—

I repeat—

Their orderly release at the earliest possible moment consistent with the effective prosecution of the war has ever been the primary consideration of both the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff—

Which, of course, includes General Marshall.

Now, did our distinguished young irresponsible friend base his remark on what those gentlemen said? Every one of them has some responsibility for demobilization directly or indirectly. No. They are all suffering from the weariness of tired old age and consequently, despite their competence to discuss that subject, despite their connection with it, and despite the fact that they are all parts of this administration and Democrats, he waved aside what they said—and I charge him with the responsibility of knowing what they said because even though he may not have time to read the papers he certainly has people around him who are doing so and reporting to him, people like his ghost writers, clipping services, and so forth. He waved aside what those gentlemen said because they were tired old men, I suppose, and he picked up what a junior major general said, who, though not so young as he is, not as old as any of the gentlemen to whom I have referred, and who is, therefore, comparatively another irresponsible youth, General Hershey, whose sole duty is to bring men into the Army and who has no responsibility whatever for demobilizing them. While an Army officer, his organization is not a part of the Army.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I shall be pleased to yield to my distinguished friend when I get through. He observes that I am speaking extemporaneously and I have only 20 minutes.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. I want to answer right there a point the gentleman is making.

Mr. JARMAN. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. I wish to answer the point the gentleman is making right at the place he is making it.

Mr. JARMAN. I shall be pleased to have the gentleman answer it when I finish. The gentleman knows my fondness for him. He knows I am speaking extemporaneously. I do not, of course, know how much time I will need. I hope the gentleman will answer it when I am through.

Mr. Speaker, here are these tired old men: Senator THOMAS is serving his twelfth year in the other body, the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman MAY, his fourteenth year here, during about half of which he has served as chairman of the all-important and quite germane Military Affairs Committee. General Marshall, of whom my colleague from Alabama spoke so complementarily a while ago, with every word of which I thoroughly agree, one of the greatest, if not the greatest, Chiefs of Staff the Army has ever had, a four-star general

who has worn that insignia longer than any American, I believe, a man who has created this Army, transported it to foreign soil, has successfully fought it, is successfully fighting it today and will continue to do so until victory crowns our efforts on every battlefield, and our flag waves supreme. He is a tired old man who is several years older than President Roosevelt. Then, there is Justice BYRNE who served 14 years in this body, 10 years in the other, 1 on the Supreme Court, 2 as Stabilization and Mobilization Director, and who is frequently referred to as "assistant" President. Despite his closeness to the President and natural familiarity with what is occurring and the intentions of the administration, he is a tired old man, several years the President's senior. Governor DEWEY waved aside what all of these gentlemen, who are so peculiarly competent to discuss the matter, say and charged the administration with this terrible, yes this unconscionable charge when all the facts are considered, because of what General HERSHEY said.

I did not know until this occurred what General HERSHEY's politics are, just as I do not know and do not care whether Generals EISENHOWER, BRADLEY, PATTON, HODGES, PATCH, and Admirals KING, NIMITZ, and HALSEY are Democrats or Republicans, they are all doing magnificent jobs on which I heartily congratulate each of them. I did not know or care because as you are all well aware, this administration has very properly and commendably been determined that the war effort profit by the use of the ablest brains in this country whether Democratic or Republican. This is evidenced by the fact that the War Department has been able to preside over throughout the war by a great former Republican Secretary of State, and it is unfortunate indeed that the world did not take the advice he gave relative to the Japanese situation while serving in that capacity in 1931. By the way, he is another tired old man. Secretary STIMSON is with one exception more than 10 years older than any of these weary old men I have mentioned and is still going very strong. Another outstanding illustration until his unfortunate and untimely passing was that able and charming gentleman, Hon. FRANK KNOX, recently a candidate for the Vice Presidency on the Republican ticket, who presided over the naval affairs of this country and who was older than any of the tired old gentlemen whose appropriate statements Governor DEWEY spurned.

So, as I stated, I did not know what General HERSHEY's politics were, but the papers now tell us that he is a Republican. He is the comparatively irresponsible youth whom Governor DEWEY in his natural irresponsibility quotes, deliberately waving aside correct information from competent men who deal with this matter and who are responsible therefor. When he did that, what did he do? He did not help one particle the morale of our troops on the battlefield or elsewhere by telling them they should come home and, "If I am elected President I am going to return you home sooner than this administration will if it

is retained in power." No; it is not helpful to morale to attempt to make soldiers believe they are being mistreated by their superiors and any effort to do so while our country is at war, whether responsible or irresponsible, is damnable conduct. In fact, were it responsible it would be treasonable. He certainly did not contribute toward expediting our war with Japan. While he did not say that the troops would be demobilized at the end of the European war but indicated that troops would be retained for the Japanese effort, his reference to voluntary soldiers and the difference in language will most probably cause Japan to misunderstand. Her only hope, just as Hitler's only hope for some time has been, is the ridiculous possibility of continuing this war sufficiently to wear us out and enjoy some kind of negotiated peace. As I say, he did not so state, but I am afraid Japan will construe his remarks to mean that if he is elected President all soldiers who wish to may come home. I say to you that he contributed nothing toward the war effort and certainly saved no American lives by encouraging Japan to carry on.

But worse than either of those, if anything could be worse, was his deliberate effort to mislead the people of America, in view of my charge that he is charged with the responsibility of knowing what those tired old men said, and particularly to play on the heartstrings of the sad and lonely mothers throughout this land, every one of whom naturally is quite anxious for her son to return as soon as possible, consistent with the war effort.

I say to you that in making that statement he was deliberately playing on the heartstrings of every one of those mothers for political purposes, which would have been quite unbecoming of one in his position even had it been true.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I will gladly do so just as soon as I have finished my statement.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I just wonder who was playing on whose heartstrings when he said "I promise again and again and again."

Mr. JARMAN. Since the gentleman inquires about the President's repeated promise not to send our boys to foreign wars, I cannot refrain from calling his attention to the fact that since Pearl Harbor this has not been a foreign war, and from saying to the patriotic citizen I know him to be, that had he made that statement "again and again and again," and had he been President when that dastardly attack occurred at Pearl Harbor, I know that he would have done just exactly what President ROOSEVELT and this Congress did. In fact, if he was present, as he generally is, he so voted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I answer that?

Mr. JARMAN. I have answered the gentleman's question. I will be glad to yield further after I finish.

I charge that in deliberately waving aside responsible testimony, even though it was from tired old men, and picking up this irresponsible testimony—because it was from a man who has no responsibility in the matter—that one of

three things was true. Governor Dewey was guilty of one of three errors, either of which is unpardonable by a man in his position. He was either criticizing something and promising to remedy that of which he knew absolutely nothing, it resulted from the natural irresponsibility of inexperienced youth which caused him to be unable to evaluate the information, or it was, as I said, this deliberate effort to play on the heartstrings of the mothers of this country.

I am frank to say, despite the fact that Governor Dewey has decreased my regard for him considerably during this tour, I still am unable to, and I will not, believe that a man who has been nominated for the Presidency by one of our great parties would intentionally stoop so low as to play on the heartstrings of the sad and lonely mothers of America in order to gain votes. Consequently, I want to believe, and do believe, that it was one of those first two, either absolute ignorance of a matter with knowledge of which he was charged by reason of his position or the natural irresponsibility of his youth. Let us compare the reactions of tired old age and inexperienced youth. Tired old age, or alleged old age in the person of the President, absolutely annihilated that charge in four words as positively and as effectively as I have ever heard any statement annihilated. When the reporter queried him in reference to what General Hershey said, he simply replied, "Is that his job?"

For further comparison let us observe the reaction of irresponsible youth to that remark. When the reporter asked this irresponsible young candidate what he thought of the President's remark, he said, "I will let you draw your own conclusion as to the inadequacy of the comment." And I am perfectly willing for you, my colleagues, and for the people of America to draw their own conclusions from this one illustration of the irresponsibility of youth, which can and will be multiplied hundreds of times before this campaign concludes.

I am perfectly willing for the world to draw its own conclusions whether the man who indulged in this great error—and that is the most charitable way in which it can be referred to—is competent to serve our Nation as its President and preside over the destinies of 133,000,000 people during the most critical period with which we have ever been confronted; and that will, I fear, be true whether 1 month, 1 year, 2 years, or 5 of the next administration be those of peace or war.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I now gladly yield to my good friend the able and distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. The gentleman has spoken on the assumption that General Hershey's only job is to take men into the Army and has nothing to do with demobilization. Is the gentleman not aware of the fact that General Hershey served with the Army and the Navy in the preparation of all plans for partial demobilization, and is in a position to

know as well as anybody in the Army or the Navy what those plans are?

Mr. JARMAN. I absolutely disagree with the gentleman that he is in position to know as well as anybody in the Army or the Navy what those plans are.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. The testimony before our committee yesterday was that he did serve with the Army and the Navy in the preparation of those plans.

Mr. JARMAN. Does the gentleman mean to express the opinion that General Hershey is more familiar with those plans and more competent on that subject than General Marshall?

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. General Marshall did not serve on the committee. What I am saying is that General Hershey, having sat with the Army and the Navy officials in the preparation of demobilization plans, was in a position to know what he was talking about when he made that statement. The gentleman is not correct in saying that his only function is to see that men get into the Army and has nothing to do with demobilization.

Mr. JARMAN. Was he serving on that committee in his capacity as Director of Selective Service? And does the Selective Service Director shoulder any responsibility whatever for demobilization?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

A REVIEW OF SOME OF OUR NATIONAL ISSUES

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present to this House a short review of the developments in our national life which I consider of the highest importance. At the same time I want to point out what this Congress has done and can do to restore normal conditions after two World Wars. It is impossible in the time allotted to me to make this a detailed presentation. I shall only attempt to draw a general outline of the situation from the perspective of my 10 years' service here in the House of Representatives.

A POOR MAN'S CONGRESSMAN

During 6 years of my service here in the House my time was devoted almost exclusively to relief problems in North Dakota and the Nation. I was a poor man's Congressman. The people of North Dakota had to eat, and it was necessary to establish work programs and, in thousands of cases, direct grants. In some of the western counties, as many as 60 percent of the farmers were on some kind of relief. Providing necessary feed and seed was another part of this poor man's program; combating grasshopper infestation was another; the conservation of water was another; the support prices for agriculture was another.

The picture is now somewhat changed. Those people who were once poor are now on their feet. Instead of having a bundle of unpaid notes and tax notices, these same folks have no outstanding notes or delinquent taxes, but instead they have cash in the bank. When a

small village like Munich, in Cavalier County, with a population of 200, has bank deposits exceeding \$2,000,000, you can readily understand a change has taken place.

In my judgment, the day is not far off when conditions will turn for the worse again. The cycle of good crop years will not always last, and when we emerge from this war and the millions return from the factories and the battlefields, there is grave doubt whether this Nation will have jobs enough to go around. This Congress is planning now to avoid a situation where we shall again have 15,000,000 jobless; private industry is working feverishly to shape itself to handle the problem, but I fear that the Government and private business, working together, cannot accomplish the full job without much hardship and perhaps suffering on the part of the people.

LABOR

Our system of free enterprise presupposes that capital and labor shall be partners in a common effort. When the system works to the advantage of each, phenomenal results are accomplished. When, for any reason, capital refuses to cooperate in this joint enterprise, and the benefits are lopsided and unjustly distributed, leaving labor a scant subsistence, trouble starts. In this war we have had an example of the two forces, labor and capital, working pretty much in harmony. There have been a few strikes, but considering the total man-hours of employment, these cases have been negligible.

Members of organized labor have struggled for half a century to make their calling honorable, to make the wage adequate to provide a decent standard of living for the worker and his family, and more is to be accomplished. When, because of a few strikes during this war, there arose the threat that labor would be stripped of all its hard-won gains, I established my position on two conclusions: First, the strikes developed because the workers could not make their wages cover the increase in the cost of living. Second, there were no disputes that could not be settled in an orderly way.

All of these disputes can be and are being adjusted and settled in an orderly way. The almost unbelievable accomplishments in our war preparation have conclusively demonstrated that our system of free enterprise is inferior to no other system, and that it is possible to maintain a fair and just balance between capital and labor. Obviously this balance cannot be held if organized labor is stripped of all of its gains over the past half century and is compelled to refrain from seeking further reforms.

OLD-AGE SECURITY

No one in Congress, during the past 10 years, has been more interested in bringing about adequate old-age security. I have addressed the House time after time on the subject and have never slacked in my efforts to have enacted an adequate old-age pension system.

The first old-age security measure was passed by Congress because of the pres-

sure brought by the Townsend organizations. While the first act was nothing but an abject dole measure, it was a beginning. The Townsend pressure still continues and will continue until a just and honorable bill is enacted. After this war it will be one of the miracles of the age if we do not go down in another depression, and the enactment of the Townsend bill will do more to avoid this plunge than any bill yet before Congress. I can see some of you smile as I say this, but it is only because you do not understand the bill.

THE FARM PROGRAM

A great many people, including some of my personal friends, were under the impression that I have been a little too willing to support the farm program of the administration. My reasons for so doing are best told by referring to the following tables:

Table I

Price of wheat in 1932, per bushel	\$0.36
Price of hogs in 1932, per 100 pounds	2.65
Price of cattle in 1932, per 100 pounds	3.30
Price of corn in 1932, per bushel	.27
Price of barley in 1932, per bushel	.14

Table II

Average price 1935-39:	
Wheat	\$0.83
Hogs	7.36
Cattle	5.80
Corn	.57
Barley	.37

Wheat increased 47 cents per bushel.
Hogs increased \$4.71 per 100 pounds.
Cattle increased \$2.50 per 100 pounds.
Corn increased, 30 cents per bushel.
Barley increased 23 cents per bushel.

Table III

The 1943 level of prices:	
Wheat, per bushel	\$1.31
Hogs, per 100 pounds	12.90
Cattle, per 100 pounds	10.00
Corn, per bushel	.93
Barley, per bushel	.96

When I came to Congress the situation in respect to farm prices was disastrous. The McNary-Haugen bill had been passed and vetoed twice. Prices had fallen to the confiscatory. See Table I set forth above. Foreclosures and dispossessions were rampant through the whole farm belt.

Under these facts should I have not been willing and ready to try any plan to bring prices up? For supporting this program I have no excuses to offer and would take like action again under like circumstances.

The program resulted in buying power for the farmers 450 percent greater than it was in 1932.

In 1932 farm foreclosures took 63.3 out of every thousand farms; and now the figure stands at a loss of only 8 farms per thousand.

Who wants to return to 32-cent wheat and 14-cent barley? Who wants to return to the days when 63 out of every thousand farms were foreclosed?

During my first 6 years' service in the House, the Congress was confronted with not only taking action to increase farm prices, stop foreclosures, assist farmers to obtain feed and seed and grasshopper poison, but there was a more serious job to undertake.

Thousands of farm families had been put out by foreclosure and had moved to the small towns and cities. They were skilled in farming and nothing else. Many thousands of these families were on relief grants, which cost the Government on the average \$750 per family a year. Something had to be done to give them a chance to help themselves.

The Farm Security Administration was set up. A lot of people fought this organization, but in my judgment it offered the only means of putting these families back on their feet. The following figures show how the program worked out in North Dakota:

Loans were made to 39,361 North Dakota farmers who were unable to secure credit elsewhere, and a total of \$16,572,149 has been loaned in the State. The farmers were helped to start over again and today they are on their feet. Over 85 percent of the principal of these loans has been paid. In addition to that, 363 farmers purchased land outright, and to date 100 percent of the maturities have been paid.

Moreover, these farmers in the Farm Security Administration program have made an outstanding record in the production of food during this war. The increased production in 1943 over that of 1942 is shown by the following table:

	Percent increase
Production of hogs	89
Production of cattle	71
Production of sheep	106
Production of milk	15
Production of chickens	80
Production of eggs	45

The following table shows that this production was extensive and important:

Sold by F. S. A. clients in 1943:	
Hogs (pounds)	10,888,157
Cattle (pounds)	19,094,236
Sheep (pounds)	2,907,552
Milk (gallons)	17,619,691
Chickens (pounds)	1,227,654
Eggs (dozen)	1,692,665

Does anyone think this Congress was wrong in making it possible for farmers who were down and out to produce not only food for themselves but to supply this country in its hour of need a vast quantity of food products, and in the process to pay off their indebtedness? The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows my stand on this matter and I have nothing to excuse or explain. No one, not even the most arrogant reactionary in the whole country will complain against this agency when he knows what has been accomplished.

DEVELOPMENT OF OUR VAST LIGNITE RESOURCES

The lack of strategic war materials has focused the attention of the whole country on the huge lignite coal deposits in North Dakota. That this coal contains limitless quantities of oil, rubber, plastics, and explosives, has definitely been demonstrated by the Bureau of Mines. Fully a year before anyone else presented these possibilities to the Congress, I presented the whole situation in two speeches on the floor of the House. Now practically every candidate in the United States claims the credit for bringing about the development of this vast

field of coal. But it will be impossible for those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to find where these same candidates ever said anything about the subject until after others had been working on the matter for a period of over a year.

The first processing plant will start its machinery in operation before there is another election in North Dakota. My record on this whole matter may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: August 20, 1942; January 12, 1943; April 7, 1943.

INDIAN CLAIMS

That the Indians of the United States have just claims against the Government for millions of dollars, no informed person denies. For 150 years we have made solemn treaties with the Indians, in which the Indians gave up title to their lands on the express promise of payment by the Government. Time has worn away year after year and still the Indians have not been paid. A few examples of this situation can be found in North Dakota.

In 1868 we made a treaty with the Sioux at Fort Rice, in which the Indians gave up title to their lands east of the Missouri River, except actual reservation lands, and in return it was agreed that the Black Hills and all country west of the Missouri River to the Rocky Mountains was to be and remain Indian country where the Indian could live unmolested.

In 1874 General Custer's expedition to the Black Hills established definitely that there was gold in the Black Hills. This information caused a grand stampede to the Black Hills and thousands of prospectors swarmed into the Hills to chase the rainbow of gold. That the country was Sioux country as established in the treaty of 1868 no one denied—not even the Government. The gold was taken and finally the land was taken, in violation of the treaty, and to this day the Sioux have not been paid a dime for their gold or a nickel for their land. The claim is still pending.

The Sioux Sisseton-Wahpeton claim, the Fort Berthold Indian claim, and the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewas claim, all present the same situation.

Since I have been in Congress, I have given attention to these just claims and have tried to have jurisdictional bills passed to permit these claims to be heard and settled, and each time the Court of Claims has in one way or another avoided a head-on decision in the matter. Four years ago I presented or caused to be presented to the two major parties a plank in respect to settling all Indian claims. The Republicans adopted the plank and the Democrats adopted one that went further than the one I presented. Yet neither party has made any move to redeem these pledges. I took the pledges seriously and introduced a Claims Commission bill which, if adopted would be the means of gathering up all these claims in a period of 5 years and settling them for good on the ground of justice and equity. But the bill will not be passed by this Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have been a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs since I have been a Member of Congress. The gentleman addressing us has also been a member of this committee. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from North Dakota on his good influence and approve his courageous stand in the deliberations of that committee; and I wish to say to the Nation, and particularly to his constituents, that there has been no more ardent champion of the rights of the aboriginal Americans than the gentleman from North Dakota. I appreciate the fairness and the boldness with which he has championed their cause, based upon an intimate knowledge of their situation.

Mr. BURDICK. Under the circumstances I shall have to thank the gentleman for his contribution. As far as I personally am concerned I introduced a bill in this House to provide for a claims commission to round up all these Indian claims and finally settle them, but there the bill remains.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I, too, happen to be a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs and fully agree with what our colleague the gentleman from Arizona has said. Let me ask the gentleman, however, if the investigating committee created by the House was not directed to study this entire question with a view to making some disposition of all these claims and also study the question of allowing the Indians free movement in the country such as other citizens enjoy?

Mr. BURDICK. I think that may have been the primary intent.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That was my purpose in supporting it.

Mr. BURDICK. We have had these investigating committees operating since 1787 when this Government came into being. I recall one report consisting of 32 volumes of an investigating committee on the question of Indian affairs. The volumes are filed, the Members have access to them, but 12 years have gone by and nothing has been done about that report and, in my judgment, nothing will be done on the present report when it is made.

SURPLUS WAR MATERIAL

When the surplus war property bill came before the House on August 15, 1944, I made an address on the floor discussing this bill—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 15, 1944. In that speech I pointed out that the Army and the Navy would have for disposal, after peace was established, approximately \$6,000,000,000 worth of property, consisting of aluminum, copper, steel, zinc, rope, lumber, wire, nails, tools, trucks, jeeps, other motor vehicles, clothing, shoes, blankets, bedding, kitchen utensils, and so forth.

The bill contained this provision:

To afford smaller business concerns, farmers, and agricultural enterprises, generally, an opportunity to acquire surplus property on equal terms with large competitors.

This did not satisfy small buyers, because the amounts offered might be more than a small concern or an individual

could buy. An amendment was then written into the bill providing that when these goods were offered for sale they should be sold in small units. As the bill was passed by the House, any quantity of goods which the small businessman needs can be purchased at the same price as a large concern taking 100 times as much would have to pay.

This bill is now in conference and the House conferees have insisted that the sale of barbed wire, tools, and all other accessories be sold in small units so that a few large concerns could not buy the whole lot in one bid.

The sale of this material will not greatly interfere with our normal production, as the amount involved covers less than 2 months of actual sales under normal conditions. Probably the most important thing about this bill is that the materials will be available to small business concerns throughout the country, and that the small businessman will also be limited in the price he asks. The result is that when this bill is passed, it will make all of this material available to the farmers and other consumers, in a fair open market, at fair and reasonable retail prices. For further information, see my speech above referred to.

WILL WE INSIST UPON THE RIGHT PRINCIPLES OF PEACE WITH THE GERMAN PEOPLE?

It is of great importance to the world what kind of peace is made with Germany. The idea that Germany as a nation must be crushed is the wrong approach to a lasting peace. That the military aggressors of Germany must be crushed is an entirely different thing. Along with our allies, we may have to do a lot of this crushing, but finally Germany herself will complete the job. The German nation has the right to live and survive and any peace that does not give her this chance will breed another war. The people who make up Germany must be given an opportunity to shape a government of their own and our interest in the matter is to see that such a government confines itself to Germany and does not again become an aggressor. Only when the evidence of aggression becomes apparent are we concerned.

If Germany as a nation is given a chance to become a law-abiding nation among the nations of the world, there is not much doubt but what she will pursue a course of action that will not interfere with her neighbors. This means, of course, that the German people must be given a clear open chance to work out their own internal difficulties, and to trade on equal terms with other nations and have the same opportunity to become a respected nation as we ourselves have. In my judgment, if this is kept in mind at the peace table, we can look forward to peace in Europe as far as Germany is concerned.

The philosophy of crushing Germany as a nation should be abandoned if we are actually looking for a durable peace.

This time we must take just as important a part in the writing of the peace as we did in the actual fighting. Last time we packed up and came home and let others write the peace terms, and they were the forerunner of this war. We should stay on the job with our men and

guns until the peace treaty is written and signed.

RECONVERSION FROM WAR PRODUCTION TO PEACETIME PRODUCTION

On this measure which is still in conference and not finally passed, I addressed the House on two occasions—see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 24 and August 31.

This bill falls far short of accomplishing full employment after the war ends. It seeks to provide security for war workers when they lose their jobs by paying them a weekly salary for 6 months after the plant closes. The rate of pay was left to each State.

I do not think this measure creates a single job. It provides pay for no jobs. It provides the worker a period of time in which he may find another job. But the bill does not create jobs; it merely pays those who have no jobs.

I am not an alarmist, or a defeatist, but I cannot quite forget the period following World War No. 1. Millions will be coming back from war plants and the armed services. They will not be looking for pay for doing nothing, but they will be looking for an actual job.

I believe that men in private industry should be given every encouragement to expand their business and take on labor, but at the same time I believe that this Government should have a plan in mind designed to supplement private industry in the huge undertaking of reemploying millions who will be looking for work. Following the first war we had no such plan, but as the jobless reached 10,000,000 and soared up to 15,000,000, we frantically worked to provide jobs overnight. The result was that W. P. A. was set up and the work attempted was in many cases work of no lasting value. Anything had to do when we had no plans. This time we should be ready with a definite works program. Public roads, public buildings, airports, repair of houses, electric lines, dams, irrigation systems, farm labor, educational assistance for those who have missed training because of the war, all present needful labor of a permanent nature.

In addition to that we must be sure that our money circulates and does not become hidden away in vaults, thus stopping development. As I pointed out in my speech of August 24, no better recovery program has been presented before Congress than the Townsend recovery plan. We should be ready with this bill when the war ends, so that we can make it impossible for money to hide itself and withdraw the blood from our financial system. Congress must take the blame if we are forced into another disastrous depression. The record is that Congress turned down an appropriation for national planning and the House refuses to debate the Townsend Act.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. We have been giving our attention to planning, of course, first things first, as we say. We have now enacted a statute in reference to the termination of war contracts. Two other

measures are on the way, now in conference, one to dispose of surplus war property and the other having to do with demobilization. I agree with gentlemen that those things come first.

However, the gentleman has hit squarely upon a very important thing and that is that we have not yet planned as we must, to take care of the ten, twelve, or fifteen million additional workers that we are going to have at the close of hostilities. We must not leave this to chance as was done before. I want private employers to give them an opportunity for employment, but it is the duty of the Government to plan wisely to take up the slack. Encourage industry, yes! Along with that the Government can match our buying power with our marvelous ability to produce by the right kind of legislation.

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman is precisely right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to thank the gentleman for what he has said and I would like to ask him if he will agree with me about the following remark. I rather think he will. That is, the crux of our problem lies in maintaining in circulation in this country a buying power that is in line with our power to produce; that in order to accomplish this one of the essential things we have got to have is the divorcement of the supply of money from an increase in the public debt in order that we can have Congress exercise its constitutional prerogative in that field.

Mr. BURDICK. I think the gentleman is correct on that. May I say—and you are going to smile when I say it, and so far as I am concerned, you can smile, for I have had that happen before—I think the one outstanding bill which will do more to cause circulation of money among the people of the Nation is the Townsend recovery plan.

When you circulate this money every month down to the grass roots, where the people live, by the time it flows around through the circulation of our national system and finally gets back into the vaults and is shut up and taken out of circulation, an equal amount is turned loose at the grass roots again.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I say that I am not one of those who smile. It seems clear and obvious that with the power to purchase which has been developed in this country during the war, and the fact that we have a full home market for what we can produce, that the necessity of a national old-age pension system should be apparent as the most just, fair, and reasonable way to maintain that circulation of buying power.

Mr. BURDICK. I thank the gentleman. May I say further that this recovery plan is not simply one for the protection of the aged alone, although that would be a very worthy accomplishment of this Congress, but it is a national re-

covery program that will keep this money circulating. You now object to a tax of 3 percent. Suppose I am a storekeeper. What difference does it make to me when I am doing business if I pay a tax? I cannot pay any tax at all if I cannot sell goods.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE. May I ask the distinguished gentleman if I am correctly informed that he is not going to be with us for the next 2 years?

Mr. BURDICK. That all depends on what the people decide on election day.

Mr. COFFEE. Is the gentleman still a candidate?

Mr. BURDICK. Like the Missouri River, I am always running.

Mr. COFFEE. That is all I wanted to find out. I am very much gratified to receive that information.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I just want to say to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] that the depression after the last war, and also the depression of 1929, was caused by the Federal Reserve System contracting the currency and retiring the Federal Reserve notes that are, to all intents and purposes, money in this country, being legal tender for all purposes. If the Congress wants to prevent a depression after this war it can do it by passing a law to prevent the retiring of these Federal Reserve notes. In 1920 we had \$5,698,000,000 in circulation, or \$53.21 per capita, but a short time after the war closed, you will remember, the Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. W. P. G. Harding, raised the rediscount rate, called the loans, and reduced the per capita circulation below \$30. That brought on the panic of 1920.

In 1929 the same crowd of financial highbinders brought about a reduction of the currency by retiring Federal Reserve notes, and again reduced the amount of money in circulation per capita below \$30. In 1920 we had \$53.21 per capita in circulation. Today we have \$164.34 per capita in circulation. At that time we had \$5,698,000,000 in circulation. Today we have \$22,699,000,000 in circulation. If we permit those same selfish financial interests to retire those Federal Reserve notes—greenbacks, if you please—when this war is over and reduce the circulating medium, we are going to have another depression the like of which probably the Nation never saw. If the Congress of the United States and the administration want to prevent a depression after this war, the way to do it is to freeze the amount of money in circulation the day the war closes and not permit them to retire those notes from circulation. That will hold up prices generally and allow farm prices to balance up to industrial prices. Then we will have prosperity for the next 10 or 20 or probably for the next 50 years.

Mr. BURDICK. I do not agree with the gentleman on everything, but he is as sound as granite on this question.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman agrees with me on most things.

Mr. BURDICK. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I was on the farmers' receiving end in that situation. The Federal Reserve Board met here on May 16, 1920, and put this thing into operation. At that time I had a large number of sheep that were worth on the average of \$8 per head. The local bank said to me, "You have to pay up." I said, "What for?" "Well, the Federal Reserve bank has demanded a pay-up system. We have to pay up and you have to pay up." I said, "The only way I can pay up is to sell the sheep." They said, "Well, sell them."

So I started to sell, and my neighbor started to sell. Everybody sold. In about 2 weeks, do you know what we were getting for our sheep when everybody had to sell? I was getting 50 cents apiece for them.

There was a story circulated in this Congress and it came right from my country, where one farmer sent down a load of sheep and the price he received did not pay the freight. They sent him back a letter saying he owed \$18. He was a good farmer—we are all good farmers, we are real sports—and he said, "I am sorry that you are behind on the proposition. I haven't any money, but I can send you another load of sheep."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. In that connection, it is well known that prices in a free economy are governed by two things, the volume of the Nation's currency multiplied by the velocity of its circulation. If the Federal Reserve banks, or the Federal Reserve Board, undertake to withdraw these Federal Reserve notes, which are legal tender in this country, if they attempt to withdraw them from circulation, then Congress should take this gold we have buried in the ground in Kentucky and set aside a sufficient amount of it, and issue currency against it, dollar for dollar for every dollar of these Federal Reserve notes that are taken out of circulation. In that way we can prevent another depression such as the gentleman from North Dakota described a little while ago.

I saw Mr. Kincaid, of Nebraska, an old man who had served faithfully here, walking around the House Office Building in 1921. I said, "Judge, what is the matter?" He said, "Corn in Nebraska is down to 17 cents a bushel; it is so cheap that people are burning it in their stoves instead of coal."

It was for no reason on earth except the contraction of the currency by the Federal Reserve System.

I am making this statement now because I expect to press it. If Congress wants to prevent a depression after this war, it can do so. We can have prosperity, as I said, for 20, 50, or 100 years after this war closes if the Congress will do its duty.

Mr. BURDICK. I do not think anyone in this Congress could state the situation any better than the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree with what the gentleman from Mississippi has said, but I go this one step further. I think we are going to have a fight to prevent deflation after this war. I think there are going to be powerful forces that are going to actually want a deflation. However, it is not going to be enough for us simply to take measures to try to maintain an active circulation of cash money. As the gentleman well knows, we are dependent for the bulk of our circulating medium upon bank credit created by the banks.

Mr. BURDICK. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That money can be taken out of circulation and destroyed by the banks simply by their refusal to renew loans or to make loans. At the present time, therefore, for our medium of exchange we are dependent upon the willingness of banks to lend money at interest and the willingness of borrowers to borrow it, which is the reason for my original question when I asked the gentleman whether he did not believe that to a large extent the solution of our problem lay in the divorce of the supply of money in this country from the volume of our debt.

Mr. BURDICK. In other words, I take the gentleman's statement to mean a large percentage of our business turnover every day is done by check, instead of cash.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right, and a large proportion of what we call money in this country is actually demand deposits, written up on the books of the banks with but 20 percent of cash money reserve behind it.

Mr. BURDICK. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from California that as long as this \$23,000,000,000 is in circulation the banks are not going to let it lie idle in their vaults without putting it back in circulation or putting it out where they can get interest on it. If you keep the amount of money which is in circulation and in business today in circulation when the war closes, you will not have any depression in this country. I think we would have a boom of prosperity for years and years to come.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include several newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE WAR IS BEING WON BY AMERICANS OF ALL RELIGIONS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to insert therewith certain excerpts from newspapers and books.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful and I know every Member is, for our great success in the war. We are winning the war on every front. The war is being won by Americans. The boys are not fighting as Catholics or Protestants or Jews. They are fighting as Americans, American soldiers. No religion and no creed can take any particular or special credit while this fight is going on. At the same time while there is complete unity of purpose on the battlefield there does not seem to be as much harmony on the home front. There are still a number of groups who are seeking to divide us and arraign one group against another. They carry on their insidious propaganda by dissemination of Nazi-inspired lies which seek to poison the minds of the American people. I think something ought to be done by this Congress to make sure that when our boys return home they will not have to face the same enemies they had to face on the battlefields. What is the policy of our Government? What are our standards of equality? So far nothing has been expressed by this Congress and nothing has been done officially to assure our people and the world as a whole that we in America do not believe in intolerance, hate, and bigotry. The moment bigotry and intolerance are permitted to spread in our country, we can no longer brag about having a healthy country, and we can no longer be sure of having won the war. We shall then have sacrificed the very principles upon which this Nation was built.

After careful study of this serious problem I introduced in June of this year, House Concurrent Resolution No. 92, which reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby express itself that whosoever conducts or participates in anti-Semitism, or other poisonous propaganda, seeking to array class against class, creed against creed, or race against race, is playing Hitler's game, and that there is no place in the lives or thoughts of true Americans for such ideology.

I hope that before this Congress adjourns sine die it will adopt this resolution so that the world may know and our people will understand that we mean to keep our basic beliefs in the basic principles of our forefathers, that all people are entitled to equal treatment, and that we will not permit the rise of Nazi or Fascist ideologies in the United States. By adopting this resolution we can demonstrate to the world that we, the Congress of the United States, representing all the people, have reiterated our faith

in the strength of our democratic way of life.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. Was not the substance of your proposed resolution contained in the Declaration of Independence, as written by Mr. Jefferson?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; in other form and language. Yes; it is one of the oldest and most basic tenets of our form of government.

Now, I have no quarrel with any man or any woman or any Member of this House. I feel that every man and woman should have an equal opportunity. When our boys come home, when they take off their uniforms, whether they be Catholics, Protestants, or Jews, I want them to come back to their homes knowing that they are all Americans, with equal rights.

Some years ago I pointed out to this Congress and to the American people that there were 110 or 120 organizations in this country, financed by certain sinister groups, who were spreading all forms of hate, intolerance, and bigotry; who were seeking to array Jew against Catholic or Catholic against Protestant.

These are the people who in my judgment are a menace to any democracy. It seems to me that the job that was supposed to have been done of ferreting out these sinister groups—some of them have been destroyed—should still continue for others are still operating. To illustrate: Our post office is being flooded with so-called second-class matter through which this propaganda of hatred is being spread to a great extent. There is no way to check up. The only way it could be checked it would be to pass House Resolution 49 which I introduced. That would take away from certain organizations who preach intolerance and hatred their second-class mail privilege. It costs the Government \$80,000,000 a year—that much of a loss annually—to distribute second-class mail. I did not seek to take the second-class mailing privilege from newspapers, publications, and responsible organizations, but my effort was to deny the second-class mail privilege to certain groups financed by foreign agitators, groups which distribute the hate program through our mails. Just when we think we can locate them they vanish and there is nothing left but a post-office box number. These groups are all irresponsible. As I said, when we think we have them located and are ready to arrest them they go to another one of our great metropolitan cities, rent another post-office box and operate through second-class mail from the new address. Because we love our country and because we want our boys to come back and find a better place in which to live we must do everything in our power to save the home front for them. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is our duty to proclaim freedom for all the people, hatred and prejudice against none. America is going to be the leader in the post-war era and we must live up to the hope and faith put in us.

The men at the peace table, especially the Americans, should make doubly sure that those who were responsible for the

killing and burning of innocent women and children shall pay the extreme penalty for their crime so as to set an example for others of their kind who might have an urge to try their program in the future.

Mr. Speaker, just as a physician himself may succumb to the virus of a contagious disease while saving numbers of unfortunate victims stricken by a raging epidemic, so a nation may be defeated by the infiltration of its enemy's ideologies even though it succeeds in gaining a physical victory on the battlefield. Realizing the danger of infection and contagion, science has gone to work and found ways and means to protect mankind against it. Is not our spiritual health as precious as our physical well-being? Why not extend our precautionary measures to the protection of the spiritual health of our people? Why not heed the symptoms of a cancerous growth which may destroy the very foundations of our accepted way of life? Why not expose the dangers to the people on whom the dastardly enemy is trying to foist itself surreptitiously?

In a recent column, writing under a Newport, R. I., September 7 date line, Cornelius Vanderbilt reported the following in his daily column in the New York Post:

The Jewish problem is the subject of more chit-chat at exclusive Bailey's Beach, the gold and clam bake clubs, the reading room and private parties than anything else save perhaps the date of the end of the European war.

Certain of the wealthier, older coupon-clippers are vitriolic anti-Semites. To hear them talk you would think you were listening to conversations at Berchtesgaden.

I dropped my own bombshell into the midst of one group last night at one of those ultrachic affairs.

I began by reminding them that Prussia seems to be the root of most of the evils which the Germans have brought to the European continent for more than 100 years. So why not, I suggested, turn all of Prussia into a free port for homeless Jews?

My remark killed the conversation. You could have heard a pin drop. The subject was changed instantly.

In his book, *The Curtain Rises*, the outstanding foreign correspondent Quentin Reynolds describes his utter amazement and horror at the conditions he found at a summer resort he went to for a short rest after returning from the battlefields of Europe. To quote Mr. Reynolds:

At the resort a man asked me where I lived. I told him I lived in New York City. "How awful," he said, looking at me sympathetically, "all you see there are Jews." "I'm used to being with Jews," I told him. "Where I've been lately the place is full of them." "Where have you been," he asked. "I have been with the First Division in Sicily," I said. "Full of Jews. It'll please you to know a hell of a lot of them were killed." He looked at me and blinked not understanding and I walked away because I was a little afraid that I might get sick or slug him. This was the America I returned to. Our men abroad deserve something better than a country which is still stupid with reaction and prejudice. There are no Democrats, no Republicans at the front. There are no Protestants, no Catholics, no Jews at the front. There are men in uniform who at the very best are giving up a year or two of their lives to serve a country they believe in.

The above quoted remarks are reports of symptoms of a sneaking, underhanded attack on the health of our Nation. Earnest observers are shocked by the similarity of the pattern of behavior of such people as Gerald K. Smith, Joe McWilliams, and William Dudley Pelley in our country and the people like Goebbels, Himmler, and Streicher in Nazi Germany. Decent people are amazed and angered that the same ideologies that brought Hitler and his gangsters into power and that brought the whole world to the brink of destruction should now be peddled within our own borders. Is it possible that—even while our boys are paying with their lives for the folly of a weak people who swallowed these horrible doctrines of super race and Aryan destiny to conquer and rule the world—the enemy has succeeded in finding a way to attack their country behind their lines? Is it possible that the enemies of civilization and humanity shall be successful in accomplishing within our borders what the courage, self-sacrifice, and gallantry of our soldiers have prevented them from accomplishing on the field of battle? Shall we permit this sneak attack on our country to go unchallenged or shall we expose these groups who seek to undermine the very foundations of our great Nation and to weaken the very structure of it? Shall we permit these termites to gnaw from within, to destroy the unity of our people by inciting the various religious and racial groups against each other?

To answer these questions, let us look at Europe. Let us keep in mind the present picture of Europe, a Europe which was beautiful until the ravaging diseases of intolerance, bigotry, and race discrimination turned it into hell on earth. Let us keep in mind the inevitable results of such spiritual illness, the concentration camps and the gas chambers where culture and the sense of values were destroyed by ignorance and mediocrity, where decency and humanity were sacrificed on the altar of greed.

Maybe, if we present the inevitable results of this dangerous illness threatening our beloved country, we may awaken our people in time to take preventive measures to smash the enemy from within.

The world was shocked by the story of the murder factory maintained by the Germans on the outskirts of the city of Lublin, which was recently liberated, but Lublin was not the only Polish city in which extermination was going on, on a mass-murder basis. In addition to concentration camps, which were established all over Poland, and into which were sent practically all Jews, and a good many non-Jews, in many places so-called labor camps were also set up just to vary the pattern of organized destruction.

These labor camps were originally organized as places where able-bodied men and women could be put to work by their German masters. But the German sadists did not get enough enjoyment out of these labor camps, and pretty soon these camps, too, were turned into gruesome death chambers where their victims were tortured until death came as a relief.

In the city of Lvov, which had a large Jewish population, amounting to about 100,000 or more, of the Jews who were not deported to Germany some 6,000 were murdered outright. The others were scattered throughout Germany and placed in labor camps, with the usual result.

In the city of Vilna, which also had a population of 100,000 Jews, only 170 Jews survived. These survivors were kept alive and forced by methods which, for sheer cruelty, cannot be equaled even by a criminally insane, to use their skills as specialists in various branches of industry for the benefit of their torturers.

In a town of Nowogrodek, out of 6,000 Jews only 200 managed to escape their cruel fate.

The Vilna district had a special furrers' Ghetto which consisted of 500 Jewish specialists and experts. The Germans deported most of its inhabitants to Estonia for forced labor, and from there only a few were able to escape by boat to Sweden.

After hiding 3 months in the cellar ruins of the Warsaw ghetto, after a heroic fight which aroused the admiration of the whole world, 60 of the Jewish fighters escaped through the sewers to carry on the fight against their oppressors.

They were eventually joined by a number of other people from the Polish underground and now constitute a regular fighting unit at present operating in various parts of eastern Poland. They claim to have killed at least 200 Germans.

Reports from Pinsk, eastern Poland, show that almost the entire Jewish community numbering over 40,000 was wiped out by the Germans. Most of them were killed in the autumn of 1941, others during 1942 and 1943. Only a few hundred Jews managed to survive, and these have formed special fighting guerrilla units to avenge the death of their brethren.

According to information of the Overseas News Agency, all the ghettos in Lutsck and in Krzenieniec were liquidated by the Germans, but some French Jews deported from France to Poland escaped, formed a number of partisan units, and are now attacking German transports and trains in the wooded country of central Poland.

A harrowing account of the sufferings of Jews deported from western Europe to Poland has been given by the underground paper of the Belgian Jewish Defense Committee, *Le Flambeau*. It is based upon information supplied by two Antwerp Jews who fled from Belgium in May 1940, were captured by the Germans in Nice, and deported to a labor camp at Sosnowiec, from where they subsequently escaped. According to their report, Jews on their arrival in the camp were stripped of their possessions as well as their clothing, and were given a few rags called working clothes, which were adorned with four yellow stars—one on the chest, one on the back, and one on each knee. The most brutal beatings were inflicted under the slightest pretext. Men and women worked in separate camps, where they were constantly subjected to inhuman treatment.

Those who were regarded as unfit for work, due to either age or infirmity, were deported to Oswiecim to be liquidated. Countless children, having heard about the horror of Oswiecim, pretended to be over 13 years of age, in order that they might be considered eligible for work. The report related to two incidents, of which the escaped were eyewitnesses. When some trucks arrived at Chraznow to take away the people unable to work, a little girl of 9 or 10, from a crowd of children and old people, ran forward to the German officer in command, fell on her knees, and begged for mercy. She cried that she was unable to do the hardest work and did not have to be sent to Oswiecim to die. The officer generously allowed the child to join those who were chosen for hard labor. After several cruel beatings at that camp the child finally met the fate she was trying so desperately to escape. A whole generation of innocent youngsters was thus starved and tortured to death by the Herrenvolk—sacrificed to the evil god of nazi-ism.

The food at the labor camp consisted of two slices of bread and a bowl of warm water a day, and the hours of labor, under the supervision of the SS, men trained in savagery, were unlimited. The rate of mortality was high. The dead were stripped of their clothing and placed in large refuse bins, and when there were sufficient corpses, they were taken by the Nazis to a crematorium. Everything was well organized—the looting as well as the killing.

Near Sosnowiec the 2 eyewitnesses saw 700 girls between the ages of 16 and 20, who had been collected from all parts of Poland, crowded in a large courtyard. These girls were selected from the population for a special fate—to be sent to the front to "entertain" the Nazi warriors.

We have heard and read so much about the gruesome details of well-organized German mass murder that our feelings have been numbed. We have almost become negatively adjusted to the unmentionable sufferings inflicted upon our fellow men, simply as a defense of our own sanity. However, no decent human being can afford this luxury of numbness. No decent human being has a right to protect his own mental and emotional stability by shutting himself off from the inhuman sufferings inflicted upon other innocent decent people. If we want to protect ourselves and our children, if we want to have a decent world to live in, we have to face the brutal forces at work abroad and—what is just as important—we must have the courage to face the apostles of hate and intolerance in our own midst. We cannot afford to lose our priceless heritage of liberty and equality, of the rights guaranteed to us under our Constitution, while we are fighting abroad to help the subjugated people of Europe to regain these rights for their people. We must show the traitors who have come amongst our people to divide us that we as a government, do not condone their activities and that we consider them subversive and contrary to the best interests of our country.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 92 in order to give Congress a chance to make our stand clear to the whole world.

Let us pass this resolution as a warning to the Gerald K. Smiths, the Pelleys, the McWilliams, and others of their ilk. Let us pass the resolution as a declaration of faith to all the decent people of this country and the world. Let us pass this resolution as a promise to all the brave, gallant men and women fighting on the battlefields and behind the barricades of occupied cities and towns. Let us pass this resolution as a solemn pledge that we shall fight the dark forces of evil so that never again will they be able to bring the world to the brink of destruction.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein an editorial from the September 9, 1944, issue of the Las Vegas Daily Optic, published at Las Vegas, N. Mex., commenting on S. 1374, authorizing the promotion in rank of the heroes of Bataan, Corregidor, Wake, and Guam, who are now prisoners of the Japanese.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on tomorrow for 10 minutes at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include a quotation from a Selma paper?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis] is recognized for 20 minutes.

BRETTON WOODS CONFERENCE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Bretton Woods, N. H., conference on monetary questions was attended by representatives of all the United Nations. The conference drew up and unanimously signed two proposed agreements to be submitted to the respective governments for ratification.

At the outset it is important to stress the fact that this was a conference of government representatives, not a conference of private bankers, and that all who attended it were acting for their governments and as government officials.

There is at present a woeful lack of understanding of the real significance of the Bretton Woods agreements. Bitter opposition has been voiced against the

Bretton Woods recommendations by conservative banking circles and particularly by those groups which can be fairly termed "international bankers." In addition there has been opposition from some earnest people who through the years have been worried about the power of international finance, but who in my judgment have misinterpreted the significance of what Bretton Woods proposes.

It would require a long time to explain or even to fully understand all the ramifications of the two Bretton Woods agreements. Certain outstanding facts regarding them, however, are clear. First and perhaps most important is the fact that neither the agreement for the international monetary fund, nor the agreement for the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development contains provisions which would rob any nation of the freedom to manage its own monetary system as it sees fit. Neither agreement would prevent a nation from expanding its monetary supply in order to combat unemployment and deflation. Neither agreement would prevent contraction to combat inflation. Neither agreement presumes to say what any nation shall use for money. Neither agreement contains any requirement compelling any nation to maintain any particular sort of metal reserves. Indeed, nations can indefinitely participate in both the fund and the bank even if they have no gold reserves at all.

Any nation is privileged to withdraw from either the fund or the bank at any time it sees fit. All it need do is give notice of its desire to withdraw and it immediately ceases to be a participant in either the fund or the bank or both.

The all-important feature of the proposed International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is the fact that if put into successful operation it would go a very long way toward putting an end to the sort of diabolical control which private international financial houses have in the past exerted over sovereign nations. One of the greatest evils of the monetary system which has dominated the world ever since the Middle Ages has been the power which private international bankers have been able to exert over whole nations and their people. The pages of history are replete with cases where nations have been compelled to go to the big bankers of London, Paris, Berlin, Tokyo, or New York and to ask on bended knee for loans to be made to them. Frequently these loans have been made at exorbitant rates of interest and on conditions which enabled foreign bankers to shape the whole course of nations, cause governments to be established or overthrown, and in all too many instances to bring on suffering, distress, and even war.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, if agreed to by the nations, would be run not by private international banking houses, but by representatives of the governments of the participating nations. Under the terms of the agreement this bank would substitute decent low interest loans made only for the purpose of developing the productive capacity of the

borrowing nations for this old system. These loans could either be made directly by the bank or the bank could guarantee loans made from private sources under conditions and terms approved by the bank. The repayment of such loans would have to be guaranteed by the governments of the borrowing nations and would in turn be guaranteed by the International Bank—thus removing the possibility of the United States going through the same experience as it did after the last world war when most of the loans made by this country were never repaid.

The agreement provides that if money were loaned to some nation, let us say to China, for the construction of a dam, a railroad, or a power system, it would be made available to her only as the actual work for which the loan was made progressed. Thus it would be possible to make certain that the money was actually used for the purpose for which it was supposed to be borrowed.

The importance of the low interest rates provided for is impossible to over-emphasize. For this means that the rate of interest on the loan would be low enough so that out of the increased productive capacity and general prosperity of the borrowing nation the loan might be repaid without undue burden and without setting up a vicious spiral necessitating the borrowing of more and more money and the constantly increasing indebtedness of the nation in question.

The kind of loans proposed to be made by this international bank are, I submit, the only sort of loans which could conceivably make possible an improvement in the international economic situation in which our own country finds herself. America desires to have a high level of exports. At the same time we are a creditor Nation and presumably we want our loans to be repaid. We desire also to maintain a merchant marine of considerable magnitude and if we do so it will of course mean that payments formerly made by us to foreign countries for shipping services and thus affording a market for our exportable goods will be no longer made and our export market will, in the absence of counteracting forces, be correspondingly reduced. Only loans which actually increase the productive standards and the living standards of other nations can help us to correct the dilemma in which our foreign trade will otherwise find itself. Again only loans of this character can promote international peace and good will. For since they will be made by an international institution it will be impossible for them to increase the stranglehold of any one wealthy nation over the internal life of a borrower nation.

I want to reemphasize at this point that neither in the case of the international fund nor in the case of the Bank for Reconstruction and Development would any private bank, any private central bank, any private international banking house or institution be able to gain political control over any nation or the relations between nations. In both cases the people and their governments would be in complete control.

It is true most of the loans would probably be made with private money, but the terms, conditions, and the guaranty would be fixed and made by the Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

I now come to a brief discussion of the international monetary fund.

The fund undertakes to make it possible for all nations belonging to it to obtain reasonable amounts of the money of other nations for use in foreign trade on condition that participating nations do not pursue policies which would interfere with the orderly settlement of international balances, nor change the exchange value of their money by more than 10 percent without the consent of the fund unless such action is taken to correct what is called a fundamental disequilibrium, a term which I shall explain more fully in a moment.

No nation having the advantage of the use of the fund could do what Germany did in the years just before the war, namely, trade on the basis of "blocked balances" which would compel another nation selling to it to purchase in all cases an equivalent amount of its goods. Neither could any nation discriminate in the matter of exchange rates by giving one nation a more favorable rate than that given to another nation. We ourselves have had the experience of certain nations giving more favorable exchange rates to Great Britain than were given to ourselves at certain times in the past.

The whole principle of the fund is to assure every nation that if it maintains a stable exchange value for its money and does not try to take unfair advantage of other nations, then it can obtain through the fund reasonable amounts of the money of other nations for the purpose of carrying on its trade. This would assure all nations, great and small, that they need not fear that artificial barriers will be placed against their trade in the future by means of exchange manipulations on the part of private international banking houses or national governments.

Let us suppose, however, that a nation feels it does not want to abide by the comparatively simple rules laid down under the fund agreement and that it takes action contrary to this rule. What then would happen to such a nation? Simply this. It would have no further access to the international monetary fund. It would from that time on have to carry on its foreign trade in the manner that has been done in the past before the fund was in existence, securing foreign exchange as best it could.

It is important to emphasize once again that any nation can withdraw from either the fund or the bank at any moment it desires to do so.

I said a while ago that nations could make changes in the exchange value of their money in order to correct "fundamental disequilibria." This statement requires some explanation. By fundamental disequilibrium, as used by the Bretton Woods agreements, is meant a situation where over a long period of time the exports of a nation substantially exceed its imports or where the imports of a nation substantially exceed its exports.

In both cases, of course, payment for services such as interest upon debt, payments for shipping, and similar items, must be taken into account. The fund agreement erects no obstacle; on the contrary, it will work to encourage any nation which is buying more than it can afford to buy in relationship to its exports to use monetary or other means to correct this situation. Likewise, it will encourage a nation whose exports substantially exceed its imports, as is the case with the United States, to take appropriate action to bring about a better balance in its foreign trade.

The one thing which America could do which would be most certain to bring about this result, the very result sought by the international fund agreement, would be for us to resolutely maintain the highest practicable national income, full employment of our people and resources, and a full home market for an amount of goods and services equivalent at least to what we ourselves are able to produce if all our people and resources are reasonably employed. Indeed, none of these plans will be successful unless America does this. For to the extent that we were foolish enough, short-sighted enough—I was about to say cruel enough—to permit a period of depression and unemployment to engulf our Nation—to that same extent our own home market would become inadequate to absorb even our own production. We would begin, as was done by every industrial nation in the war-breeding period before this conflict began, to seek desperately for export markets, to shut out imports, to take measures which would lead to further a flow of gold into this Nation in exchange for exports, and do all the other things which lead ultimately only to economic disaster and, in the present instance, to war itself.

The whole impact of the fund agreement so far as our own country is concerned would be to encourage us to resolutely keep the volume of active purchasing power in our country at a level high enough to provide not only a market for what we can produce but a market for a volume of import goods equivalent to the value of the exports which we, of course, earnestly hope to make.

Under the fund agreement the money of each nation would originally be valued in terms of gold. This, however, so far as I am able to discover in no way implies any requirement that a nation maintain gold reserves or that its money be of any one kind or another. Valuing the currency in terms of gold is only done for the purpose of providing a convenient common denominator so far as I am able to see from my study of the agreement. If I believed for a moment that either of these agreements contained elements which would tend to drive the nations back onto a gold standard I would oppose them with all the vigor at my command. I will go further and say that if anyone can show me how either agreement would lead to this result I will change my position of support of these agreements. But I cannot find that element in either agreement.

Once currencies were valued at what is called a par value in the agreements

nations would still be able to make changes of not more than 10 percent in the exchange value of their money merely by informing the fund that they were doing so, but entirely without the necessity of the fund's agreement. Again every nation would have unlimited leeway to correct a fundamental disequilibrium if such existed. In simple terms what this would mean would be that a country importing beyond its exports and thus running constantly into greater and greater debt would be positively encouraged by the fund to raise the price of gold—thus making its money worth less in terms of gold—thus in turn reducing the buying power of its money abroad, tending to cut down its imports and making its goods cheaper. This it would be hoped would increase its exports, lead to further employment and production, and ultimately correct the so-called disequilibrium. A nation on the other hand faced with a chronic excess of exports could either lower the price of gold in terms of its money to make its money more difficult to get and to make its foreign purchases easier, or it could maintain a higher level of national income at home—thus expanding its home market. Obviously the latter course would be the one for the United States to pursue, especially since the American market is by far the most important single market in the whole world.

In other words, under the terms of this agreement the thing for the United States to do would be to adopt monetary policies which would make certain that our money in circulation would expand as rapidly as our production increased. This, so far as I can determine, would be the one primary duty that America would have under the terms of this agreement. It is obviously a duty which we owe to our own people in any case.

Thus the operation of the fund would encourage each nation to pursue the kind of monetary policy which would lead to the best results, not only for its foreign trade but for its own internal economy as well.

And, finally, if this international fund is successful, it might well mark by far the longest step that has ever been taken in the history of the world toward putting international trade on a truly orderly and mutually advantageous basis. And it would prevent private international bankers from manipulating the exchange value of the currency of different countries for their own private gain and to the destruction of the prosperity of the peoples within those nations.

It is important to emphasize, however, that under the fund agreement, the fund has no power to compel any nation to change the par value of its currency without the consent of that nation itself. This is crucial, I believe, for I think to have attempted to set up any international monetary body which would have been given power to dictate policy to the nations of the world would have been more likely to lead to conflict than to peace. This agreement, however, does not do so. It offers certain very real advantages to all nations which play the game according to the rules. Nations

not choosing to do that are not penalized or punished. They simply cease to have the advantages which the fund offers.

The stabilization fund will amount to \$8,800,000,000, the nations subscribing quotas to the fund in proportion to their financial resources and having a voting power corresponding to their quota contributions. The United States would subscribe a quota of \$2,750,000,000 and would have approximately 28 percent of the voting power in the fund. The United States, Great Britain, self-governing British dominions, and almost any other one country of reasonable size, such as France or China, or one of the larger Latin American countries, would command an actual majority of the voting power in the fund.

As to the bank the proposed share capital to be subscribed by the national governments would be \$9,100,000,000, of which the United States would subscribe \$3,175,000,000. In this case the United States would enjoy a voting power of 31.37 percent and together with Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand would command an absolute majority of the voting power.

Both the fund and the bank are to be managed by a board of governors consisting of 1 representative from each nation and delegating to the executive directors most of the actual functions of management and decision. In each case there would be 12 executive directors chosen as follows: The United States, Britain, Russia, China, and France will have 1 director each and the remaining 7 will be elected by the other members under a system of proportional representation except that as to the fund, 2 of these additional 7 directors are specifically reserved for Latin America. It will be clear, however, that the actual control rests with the voting power of the different members and the votes of the directors will be weighed accordingly.

Anyone would be foolish to contend that even should both of these agreements be adopted by the nations and put into full effect it would offer any cure-all for the economic problems of the world. Indeed, as I have already pointed out, unless full employment and a high level of national income is maintained in the United States there is little hope that either the peace or the jobs and opportunity which have been promised to returning fighting men by ourselves and representatives in every nation, can be achieved. Nonetheless, as instruments tending to help bring about that result and similar results in other nations insofar as an international monetary program can do so, these two proposed Bretton Woods agreements recommend themselves as most important forward steps. The only single thing in the monetary field which is more important than the ironing out of international monetary problems is the establishing of a scientific monetary system within the borders of the nations themselves.

I have had much to say on this subject since I have been a Member of Congress. Indeed I have even written a book on the subject. The key to the estab-

lishment of a monetary system which would be in accord with modern economic conditions is a comparatively simple one. It consists of having the Nation take unto itself the function of the creation of the medium of exchange and exercise that function in such fashion as to maintain a constant balance between production of real wealth on the one hand and the supply of active buying power on the other. This must be done without further increasing the national debt or adding to the interest burden of the people. That it can be done that way no one will seriously question. That it must be done that way is to me evident from the single fact that the one basic economic cause of the world dislocations which paved the way for the present war was the failure of every important industrial nation in the world to maintain the buying power of its own people at a level sufficient to provide a home market for a volume of goods and services equivalent to its home production. Unless we correct this maladjustment we may do all other things, but we will still fail future generations in this most critical hour of the world's history.

Peace must be built after this war has finally been won. For the next war of which some talk so glibly will see robot bombs falling not just in England but all over the world and B-29's not in our hands alone but in the hands of all belligerents as well. Even as the present war so far as destruction of the life and wealth of the world is concerned has been manifold worse than was World War No. 1, so World War No. 3 would be in geometric proportion yet more terrible—especially for the women and children of all the cities of the world, the wives and children of the very soldiers who at this moment are winning this conflict.

If this fund and this Reconstruction Bank—if this unanimous agreement of all the United Nations were to contribute in any substantial degree at all to that peace which mankind must build—then it is worth many times the \$6,000,000,000 which our country would subscribe. Indeed that sum is less by \$1,000,000,000 than the cost of this war for one month to the U. S. A. And, be it added, even if in a sincere attempt to advance the peace of the world we had to in some degree risk the \$6,000,000,000, that would certainly be far, far better than to risk loss of the far more precious lives of another generation of America's young men.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

KIMMEL AND SHORT

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I am addressing myself at this particular time to the Society of Pseudo Bleeding Hearts for Kimmel and Short. I have sat in this body for the past 8 years and during that time I have come to have a high regard for the Members of this House, both personally, and as to their motives and their patriotism. But, for the past few days I have wondered just what it is that is causing some of the Members on the other side of the aisle to be carried

away on flights of fancy with a complete disregard for the record. This would be amusing, were it not for the fact that the gravity of the accusations is likely to influence the views of many of the people of this country.

Admiral Kimmel and General Short were not mere fighters. They were officers of the highest rank; men who had been entrusted with a great responsibility. They were possessed of knowledge relative to the national danger and national defense that was not known to even Members of Congress. They were men who had been selected with care because it was felt that they were men of common sense and sound judgment. It was felt by those in charge that these men had a grave sense of responsibility and that they were conscious of the fact that they were in command of those forces that we had looked upon as our first line of defense against a potential enemy for many years.

In the days before Pearl Harbor, we were engaged in a conference with the Japanese representatives that had been called at the request of the Japanese Emperor. While we were a peaceful, civilized Nation accustomed to dealing with people whose traditions were the same as our own, we nevertheless knew that Japanese and American relations were skating on very thin ice. There was talk in this House, in the press, on the air, of the danger that confronted our country. Months before the women folks had been ordered out of our Pacific island possessions. The children on the streets knew and sensed that there was some grave danger hovering over the land. But, above all, the two gentlemen who stood on the front line, Admiral Kimmel and Lieutenant General Short, knew better than others how fraught the situation was with danger. They admitted their consciousness when they admitted that they had almost daily conferences about the situation. They had requested additional support in the way of men, supplies, and equipment. They knew, as did every citizen in the country, that the negotiations between the two powers seemed doomed to failure. What did they do? Did they take the precautions that normal men would have taken under the circumstances? No. Admiral Kimmel brought into Pearl Harbor the greatest vessels of our fleet and tied together three battleships deck to deck so that men could walk from one ship to another despite the fact that he knew of the imminent threat. It was not that this represented an investment of one hundred and fifty million dollars, it was that these ships were the first line of defense between our country and the Japanese. Surely the Commander in Chief could not be held responsible for the berthing of the fleet in the harbor. Surely, the Commander in Chief did not allow shore leave for the major portion of the men.

Did General Short take the precautions that a normal man would take? Did he have his scouting reconnaissance out in force, or did he have them drawn up wing to wing on the ground of the flying field near Schofield Barracks? Did he have additional men at the out-

lying posts where detection could be made? Not that I know of.

I know that most of what has been said here during the past 10 days has been said in innuendo and based on rumor, but innuendo and rumor are dangerous things in times such as these when the Nation should be united. True is true and false is false, but the Hall of Congress is not the place that should act as a sounding board for innuendo and rumor that will do nothing but disunite our people. Could it be that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are defending General Short because he is one of the few Army officers who have placed into Who's Who that he is a member of the Republican Party, or can their motives be solely due to the fact that the election is 6 or 7 weeks away? They are charging the defeat at Pearl Harbor to the Commander in Chief. Let us use our common sense. Suppose there is a conflagration in the city of Washington and the fire department responds; does the chief of the fire department take every precaution to stop it, or does he stand back and say, "No; I cannot do anything until I receive my orders from Congress, which is my governing body"?

Kimmel and Short have been educated for 30 years by the taxpayers of this country. They have been trained in schools we maintain to face a situation such as they did. They were conversant with the danger and in any nation of the world but these United States they would have been held to a very grave responsibility. I know—I am not a neophyte myself—that politics is played in this Chamber, but politics should never be played to the detriment of the people of a country. Their faith should not be shaken on mere rumor and innuendo.

It seems strange to me that suddenly, 7 weeks before a Presidential election, the other side becomes the champion of Kimmel and Short. We all know that the morning after November 7 Kimmel and Short will be dropped like a hot cake by their champions and they will drift into the mumbo-jumbo of forgotten things. I have not heard a word said on the other side of the aisle as to what happened 24 hours after Pearl Harbor was bombed. Has anyone raised his voice in this Chamber to tell how 95 percent of General MacArthur's air force was destroyed on the ground in the Philippines despite the known fact that the Hawaiian Islands had been bombed 24 hours before? Is politics being played there? Is it because of the fact that many Members on the other side of the aisle think that General MacArthur has a large following in this country and it might affect the vote? General MacArthur has gone forward and proven himself a great soldier. We are proud of him as Americans. We hope to see the day when he leads his troops back triumphantly to the Philippine Islands, but he too was guilty of carelessness, yet the other side of the aisle treads softly on that score.

I appeal to all the Members of this House in these trying days not to allow partisan politics to go so deeply as to affect the foundations and strength of our country, for rumor which has no

foundation in fact will disunite our people and ultimately destroy our Nation.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, if there are no further special orders, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at this time for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the partisan political speech to which we have just listened proves beyond doubt the necessity of the country being told the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about the attack on Pearl Harbor, and the incidents leading up thereto.

The attack on Pearl Harbor resulted in the greatest disaster in our naval history. General Short and Admiral Kimmel were in command and, under the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, directly responsible for the protection of Pearl Harbor. A mistake was made somewhere and by somebody. The Commander in Chief immediately removed Kimmel and Short from their respective commands and placed them on the inactive list. Since that time they have had no connection with or part in the carrying on of the war.

Immediately following Pearl Harbor, the Presidential commission, headed by Mr. Justice Roberts, of the Supreme Court, proceeded to Pearl Harbor and presumably made a careful and complete investigation as to the cause and the effect of that terrible catastrophe. It was the job of this commission to find out who erred, who was to blame, and the circumstances making this attack possible. This investigation was properly conducted in a secret manner. The testimony of the witnesses was transcribed. At the conclusion of the taking of this testimony a report was made by the commission to the Commander in Chief. The detailed report made was revised and, my understanding is, that only such parts were included in the report made public as were approved by the Office of War Information. No one can object to the proceedings thus far. No one even suggested that any information that might aid the enemy should be made public. However, almost 3 years have elapsed, and it would seem that releasing the facts at this time could in no way give comfort to any enemy. The time for court-martialing Short and Kimmel has elapsed. The Congress has taken action to legally extend the time. Short and Kimmel have voluntarily waived the statute of limitations; that is, rather than attempting to avoid court martial and trial, they are demanding trial by any agency that will furnish a forum making it possible for the world to know the truth.

The remarks of the gentleman from New York indicate that he is not familiar with all of this. Be it remembered, that both Kimmel and Short, in season and out of season, have asked the Congress, the President, as well as the Army and Navy authorities, for an opportunity to be heard. Is there anything unfair about that? Is it not in keeping with

the American concept of justice and fair play?

Here are the reputations and standing of two of the highest military officers in the land being shunted about as a political football. It is fundamentally wrong. There is no practical excuse for the continuation of this type of conduct on the part of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, as I said on the floor the other day, out of an abundance of caution I have refrained from making reference, publicly or privately, to this Kimmel-Short incident. There comes a time, however, when patience ceases to be a virtue, and when fairness requires strong language. The time when the developing of the story of Pearl Harbor will hinder our military effort is long since past. Mr. Speaker, here are two men who, before Pearl Harbor, were outstanding leaders in our armed forces. Are they guilty of misconduct in connection with Pearl Harbor, or did they follow instructions? Are they innocent or culpable? I do not know. The country does not know. But there are those who do know, and they should be permitted or required to speak.

Yes, this is an election year and speeches like the one delivered by the gentleman from New York add nothing to national unity and are based on rumor and conjecture.

Again I say the necessities of the hour require consideration of this matter now. The Commander in Chief selected these men for the positions which they held. Both were educated in our great service schools. Each acquitted himself well before Pearl Harbor, and with records of this kind back of them it is only right that the cloud now hanging over them should be removed if they are innocent. On the other hand, if they are guilty, then they cannot be too severely condemned and even punished.

It has been said that Kimmel at least was promoted over officers who outranked him by the President in order that he might represent the Commander in Chief in the Pacific. It is true that he was selected by the President as his representative for this particular mission and, if he disobeyed instructions given by the Commander in Chief with reference to the defense of Pearl Harbor, then the country should know it.

The military rules and regulations, the honor of our military men, and the law of the land close their lips at this time. There they are, held up to scorn and disdain, hoping, praying, beseeching, that they be given an opportunity to tell the truth. Is there anything unfair about that?

Mr. Speaker, let there be action. Turn on the light of publicity. Give the whole story to all the people, and do it now.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Surely, I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I admit with the gentleman, that Kimmel and Short were taken out of their regular order, but I also admit that the President of the United States took General Marshall, General Arnold, Admiral King, Admiral Nimitz, and Admiral Halsey out of their regular order, for the betterment of our

country. Will the gentleman deny that some of the men who get up on this floor and defend Kimmel and Short are the very men who 2 or 3 years ago did everything within their power on this floor to stop this Nation from preparing, who did everything in their power to beat conscription, to defeat lend-lease, and to defeat everything that would save hundreds of thousands of American lives in the days that were to come? And they now get up and fight the battle of Kimmel and Short because they are trying to drag a red herring across their own records.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand, no charges have as yet been filed against these men. They are just suspended in air, and, when demands are made for fair treatment, responses like the one just made by the gentleman from New York are entirely irrelevant. That kind of talk is the red herring to which the gentleman refers. It is a wonder he did not call attention to the myth about fortifying Guam and some other similar matters. The fact that some of those who are demanding justice now did not want to get into this war has not a single thing to do with this issue. This whole controversy can be satisfactorily settled in the minds of all the people if we are just permitted to have the facts. The inference that those in authority are afraid to have the truth known is not good for the morale of our people.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I do not yield any further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPARKMAN). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is very seldom that our distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] makes other than factual utterances, which he has, to some extent, made during the last 4 or 5 minutes. There are some things my friend said with which I think we all agree. One thing about my friend from Michigan, whatever he says he firmly and honestly believes. This entire body has profound respect for the gentleman. My friend engaged in some non-factual expressions, in part, during his 4-minute speech.

I do not know whether Kimmel and Short are guilty or innocent. As far as I can remember, this is the first time I have ever mentioned their names on this floor. I am not going to mention their names any more, because the outcome of their cases is a matter which must and will be determined upon evidence that will be produced at the right time. As far as I am concerned, I proceed upon the theory that the War Department and the Navy Department are charged with the actual conduct of the war; the war on the land and in the air where the land forces are involved; the Navy, at sea, in the air, and under the sea.

I assume that for practical reasons those who determine policies in both the War Department and the Navy Department in relation to the conduct of the war have felt it was advisable in connection with the conduct of the war to have the courts martial of these men held in abeyance. I make that statement upon no information I have had from anyone but drawing my own personal deductions.

I cannot challenge the opinions of those charged with the responsibility of conducting the war; I have got to accept the word, expressed or implied, of General Marshall, of Admiral King, and those associated with them on legislation and on matters concerned with their conduct of the war. I can remember sitting in conference with others one time with General Marshall before Pearl Harbor when my views somewhat differed from his. General Marshall said, in substance: "Gentlemen, as Chief of Staff and charged with the responsibility of conducting our land forces, our Army, in my opinion such and such a thing is necessary, such and such a bill in my opinion should be passed by Congress." And I said: "General, I cannot challenge your statement; I cannot take a position in opposition to you. No matter what my opinions are, General, they are laid on the table and I shall do what you, as Chief of Staff, think I should do as a Member of Congress having in mind the imminent danger that confronts our country."

So far as lifting and promoting men over others are concerned, I am sure my friend from Michigan did not want to leave the wrong impression. That is done repeatedly; it has been done in peacetime. As I understand it there are selection boards in both the Army and Navy, and they have regular procedures in making their recommendations. If I am wrong or if my friend from Michigan disagrees with me I shall be very pleased to yield for correction.

Mr. MICHENER. No; I would not say that the gentleman was wrong. I know he would not knowingly be wrong. I do not think it is important as to whether or not these men were lifted out of their order, but the gentleman from New York attempted to justify that by saying that General Marshall was lifted out of his order. If he was it was a mighty good lift, for he is doing a mighty good job of carrying on this war. If these two men were just as good as the others who were lifted, simple justice demands that they be given a fair show.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. No one will contradict the statement of my friend from Michigan; on the other hand if in the past, or conducting the trials openly now, would have been or would be inconsistent with the best interests of our country I know my friend from Michi-

gan will agree that the course of action to be taken should be that for the best interest of our country. The best interest of the country overshadows the interest of any individual, particularly in matters of this kind.

Mr. MICHENER. That is why I refrained and never said a word.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am refraining now; I know the gentleman has. I assume the War Department and the Navy Department for reasons of state, the state being our Government, have not taken any other course of action.

Secretary of War Stimson is a great American. I do not agree with him all the time; I do not have to in order to respect him. We all know he was a member of the Cabinet under previous Presidents; assuredly he is serving as an American. He is not a Democrat, and I do not bring that in for the purpose of saying he is a Republican, but certainly he is a member of the Republican Party; nevertheless he is Secretary of War, and I assume he has a voice in determining when the trials shall take place; and I assume that up to the present time for reasons connected with the best interests of our country these trials have not taken place.

As far as General Marshall is concerned and the statement that he was selected over officers of greater seniority let me tell you of a little incident that occurred. I was sitting one evening at an informal dinner alongside of a vice admiral of the Navy. It is unnecessary to mention his name, but he is a fighting man. He said to me, "McCORMACK, an officer takes care of his enlisted men first. When we are out on duty we think of them first. An officer eats last, an officer goes to bed last, when he and his men are out."

That is the kind of an officer I was talking to. He is a vice admiral. He also spoke to me about a gentleman up in an east coast navy yard who is a captain and he asked me: "McCORMACK, do you know him?" I said, "No, but I know of him." He said, "He and I went through Annapolis together. He is one of my closest friends. I consider him the best all around officer in the Navy, and I cannot understand why it is I am a vice admiral and he is only a captain. This was a man who is a vice admiral today speaking. He told me, 'He is a far better man than I am but for some reason I am a vice admiral through selection and this man is still a captain, yet I consider him one of the best, if not the best, all around officer in the Navy today.'"

I just give that as an illustration. You and I may not agree with the action that has been taken on some promotions but, nevertheless, it is something which is exclusively within the Army and Navy, and I refer to the selection of officers for promotion.

It would probably be best if for the remainder of the time between now and election day we let the matter of General Short and Admiral Kimmel rest with the proper authorities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 14, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4527) granting a pension to Laura E. Silvey, and the same was referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 5349. A bill to permit weekly newspapers to suspend publication for not more than two issues in any one calendar year without loss of second-class mail privileges; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 5350. A bill to amend the act of May 25, 1938, as amended, relating to the temporary detail to certain foreign governments of United States employees, and to render closer and more effective the relationship of the United States with other countries, in technical, professional, and scientific matters; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARE:

H. J. Res. 309. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of expert employees to assist major standing committees of the Senate and House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. J. Res. 310. Joint resolution requesting the President to establish friendly diplomatic relations with Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 5351. A bill for the relief of Michael Abarno; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 5352. A bill for the relief of Joseph O. Mello and Antonio Mello as next of kin of Michael O. Mello; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5353. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Alarie; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5354. A bill for the relief of Christian O. Mello; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 5355. A bill for the relief of Charlie Powell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 5356. A bill for the relief of the Southern Bitumen Co., of Ensley, Ala.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 5357. A bill for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 5358. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. R. 5359. A bill for the relief of Adell Brown and Alice Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 5360. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Mona Mae Miller, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5361. A bill for the relief of Harold J. Grim; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 5362. A bill for the relief of the Jay Taylor Cattle Co., Amarillo, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6102. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. Perley M. Hall and 12 other citizens of Carthage, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6103. Also, petition of Earl H. Elliott and 18 other citizens of DeBeque, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6104. Also, petition of A. Evert Walter and 110 other citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6105. Also, petition of Mrs. Henry Goings and 72 other citizens of Jenkins Jones, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6106. Also, petition of Ethel Bennett and 50 other citizens of Mayfield, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6107. Also, petition of Mrs. O. H. Berlekamp and 61 other citizens of Bettsville, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6108. Also, petition of Flora L. Ries and 37 other citizens of Barberton, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the

duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6109. Also, petition of Ethel Hulick and 44 other citizens of Albuquerque, N. Mex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6110. Also, petition of E. F. Glenn and 60 citizens of Glendale, Ky., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6111. Also, petition of Gertrude B. Gates and 74 other citizens of Wilmington, Del., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6112. Also, petition of Ora C. Pennebaker and 43 other citizens of Muskegon, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6113. Also, petition of J. B. Chisum and 446 other citizens of Altus, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6114. Also, petition of Rev. R. Gordon Given and 27 other citizens of Westover, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6115. Also, petition of Mrs. T. M. Strong and 40 other citizens of Dodgeville, Wis., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6116. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the Barry Wehmiller Machinery Co., signed by 30 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6117. Also, petition of the Barry Wehmiller Machinery Co., signed by 30 St. Louis citizens protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6118. Also, petition of Peter Eisel and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6119. By Mr. FOGARTY: Petition of American citizens of Polish descent in the State of Rhode Island, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to aid to Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6120. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition submitted by Taxpayers' Local Option Committee, John Timothy Smith, attorney, signed by 945 citizens of central New York, in opposition to any prohibition legislation on the ground that it would impede the war effort and bring back the evils of bootlegging and racketeering; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6121. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of National Association of County Officials, Resolution No. 1, dated July 26, 1944, regarding payment of taxes on property acquired by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

6122. Also, petition of National Association of County Officials, Resolution No. 2, urging passage of House bill 2241, abolishing Jackson Hole National Monument; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

6123. Also, petition of National Association of County Officials, Resolution No. 3, dated July 27, 1944, requesting Senate bill 1940 be changed from permissive to directive; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

6124. Also, petition of National Association of County Officials, Resolution No. 6, supporting Senate bill 2045, as amended, for distribution and sale of war surplus commodities; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal One, unto whom all hearts are open and all desires known, who art the glory of day and the master of night, hear our humble prayer. Through the revelation of Thy truth, let us clear our minds of ignorance, prejudice, and intolerance. O spirit of God, heavenly tide, flow wider and deeper, cleansing the thoughts of every section of our broad land.

We pray that with patriotic zeal and devotion our fellow citizens may reach those altitudes of reason where they shall hear the clarion voice of right whereby our Government was conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. In Thy divine nearness, grant that every decision may disclose the counsels of an all-wise mind. O create within us the sincerest conviction as to the dire need and peace of the world. At eventide may we take comfort in the realization that in the depths of a good, clean conscience there can be no failure. As we have tasted the sweet and the bitter cup of human experience, inspire us to throw out the challenge, building our lives, not on time but on the magnificence of big and enduring realities, knowing that our Saviour will hold and help us until the morning breaketh. In His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 312. An act for the relief of Freda Utley;

H. R. 527. An act for the relief of Mary Hertz;

H. R. 1623. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States," approved February 11, 1925 (43 Stat. 857), as amended (28 U. S. C., secs. 518-555);

H. R. 1680. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge;

H. R. 1708. An act for the relief of Perley M. Silver;

H. R. 2134. An act for the relief of Paul Szeliga;

H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of John Salfi;

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Joseph Scarpella and Dorothy Scarpella;

H. R. 2509. An act for the relief of Marie Engert;

H. R. 2792. An act for the relief of Arvo Karl, Lempi K. Holm, and Burt Johnston;

H. R. 3033. An act for the relief of Tressie Spring and Mrs. Hazel Stutte;

H. R. 3038. An act for the relief of Mrs. Grace Page;

H. R. 3296. An act for the relief of R. Guy Dorsey;

H. R. 3384. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept property for the Moores Creek National Military Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3464. An act for the relief of Ralph W. Cooley;

H. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Ernest A. Grottko;

H. R. 3722. An act to amend section 342 of the Nationality Act of 1940 in respect to fees for the issuance of certificates of arrival; and

H. R. 5025. An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War No. 2.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1569. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes," approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 536; 28 U. S. C. 543); and

H. R. 2707. An act for the relief of Henry White.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 725. An act to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting and certain other laws;

S. 1062. An act to authorize certain employees of the General Land Office to administer or take oaths, affirmations, affidavits, or depositions in the performance of their official duties;

S. 1392. An act for the relief of Dewey H. Davis;

S. 1557. An act for the relief of Joel A. Hart;

S. 1732. An act for the relief of Arthur M. Sellers;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of C. C. Thornton;